

# SOUTHERN QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1851.

---

VOL. III.

NEW SERIES.

No. 5.

WHOLE No. 37.

---

## ART. I.—HISTORY OF THE POLK ADMINISTRATION.

*History of the Polk Administration.* By LUCIEN B. CHASE,  
a Member of the twenty-ninth and thirtieth Congresses.  
New-York: George P. Putnam. 1850.

THE question of the annexation of Texas was that which swamped the political fortunes, in 1844, of Clay and Van Buren. The same question proved the friendly wave upon which James K. Polk was borne into the presidency. But for this question, we should never have been blessed with a history of the Polk administration. The endowments of Mr. Polk, himself, were not of a kind to secure for him an historical position. But for singularly favourable events, he would have run his race without distinction, if not in comparative obscurity. He represented only the average mind of the country—he was not endowed with heroism of character—and, though quite respectable in affairs, he possessed no qualities calculated to give him rank, or to make him conspicuous. Of mild and amiable deportment, good common sense, some experience in national politics, a fair position in his own State, he probably never dreamed of, or aimed at, a higher destiny than he had already achieved, as Governor of Tennessee, and Speaker of the House of Representatives. In neither of these situations had he made himself remarkable. In both of them he had been

respectable, and had, perhaps, afforded as little occasion for complaint as applause. The caprice of fortune found him the creature of an emergency, of which his own genius would never have made him the creator—found him triumphant, in a political contest, with men infinitely superior in rank, and very much his superior in intellect, if not in morals. This may be said, with safety, of both Clay and Van Buren. These gentlemen, representing the two great parties of the country, had, at the opening of the canvas of 1844, for the presidency, appeared to have the game very much in their own hands. At this period, it was apparently reduced to a seeming certainty, that they were to be the pitted champions in the field. The question of the annexation of Texas was a dilemma to both. The free States were hostile to any accession of strength or territory to the South. The support of Mr. Clay was to be derived chiefly from the former section. To Mr. Van Buren, the question was equally embarrassing, in the same quarter. It was a happy *instinct*—so thought, no doubt, by these antagonists—to take the same view of the subject, and oppose the annexation of the new State to the confederacy—and particularly, too, as the friends of Mr. Tyler, who had no chance, were disposed to use the measure, as political capital, in his behalf—and, had there been no alternative for either of the national parties—had it been compulsory upon them both to have confined themselves to these two candidates, only—no policy could have been better chosen for depriving the novel question of all power to embarrass the contest, on either side. Neither of them dreamed that the question of annexation was stronger than them both. They both underrated greatly the popular interest in the subject, and the hold which it had taken upon the national mind; and, in thus erring, they exhibited a singular disregard, or ignorance of, the great passion, which we inherit from our Norman ancestry, for the acquisition of territory. It may be added, in respect to Mr. Van Buren, that his opposition tended somewhat, in the South, to urge the measure, with increased force, upon the affections of his party. The truth is, it was desirable to get rid of him. He had survived his uses; and the policy of annexing Texas, the moment that he opposed it, became doubly imposing, as it afforded a means for casting off an incubus. The adoption of the two-thirds rule, for nomination, in the demo-



cratic convention, which was due entirely to the South, was the means by which he was defeated; and Mr. Polk was the compromise candidate—a remarkable illustration, by the way, of the power of party organization, subjecting, as it did, the most hostile tempers, the most mortified moods, the most peevish ambitions, the most jealous hate, and many disappointments, to a submissive deference, and such a fraternization, for the single purpose, of characters the most opposite, as may not often be seen in any similar history. This wonderful power, of party drill, secured for the nominee the support even of those who had preferred Van Buren. The question of annexation brought him supporters from the other party. It determined, in the South, all that large class of persons who usually vote with little regard to party. It lost, to Mr. Clay, a large Southern vote, affecting him in a still more injurious manner than Van Buren. In his case, his opposition to the annexation of Texas, which he himself had long before pronounced a portion of our national domain which the government had no right to part with or repudiate, was now assumed to be a sacrifice of his own section—of the rights and interests of the South—for selfish purposes;—his bid, in other words, for the free soil support of the north, in opposition to Mr. Van Buren. Mr. Chase, in the work before us, observes that, “the attachment of the whig party to Mr. Clay proved more powerful than their desire for the admission of Texas into the Union.” As a party, such was probably the case; but it was one of those errors by which a party perils itself, unwisely, for a person. The test was too severe a one for the rank and file, and the result told fearfully against their candidate, in the popular vote that was given. The election of Polk was, in absolute terms, the declared will of the people for the annexation of Texas. In no other way can we account for the sudden change in the position of parties. But four years before, Harrison, the whig candidate, had succeeded, by a large majority, over his democratic opponent. The democratic vote, by which Polk was elected, exhibited a majority of sixty-five, over that given to Henry Clay. It is true, that the course of Tyler, after the death of Harrison, for a while discouraged the whigs, and lessened their authority; but their apathy seemed to be fully discarded when they entered into the contest of 1844. Nobody can question the zeal which

they displayed, whether as individuals or a party, when the new canvas was begun; and their enthusiasm was accompanied by a sanguine confidence of success, which derived no small portion of its stimulus from the acknowledged obscurity of the opponent with whom they had to contend.

This remark leads us to a reflection, the importance of which demands the calm consideration of those who regard, in the existence of rival parties, a wholesome principle of vitality in the affairs of a republic. We certainly concur with Jefferson, in a full recognition of the uses of party. A nation may be fairly and equally divided, on questions of policy and expediency; and these questions may be of the most pregnant significance to the life and well-being of a State or people. It is highly important that the struggle should take place—should, indeed, continue to take place—so long as vital differences of opinion exist, with regard to a national policy. The struggle is suggestive of unceasing watchfulness, on the part of the people, over their affairs; of a scrupulous vigilance in observing the conduct of public men; of a jealous regard to the safety of principles which are precious to popular liberty. But there is always something exceedingly suspicious in a party progress which rejects the use of its ablest men—which studiously thrusts them aside, to make way for those, from whose known inferiority of intellect nothing can be expected; and which prefers, to high endowment, and the inflexible will which is apt to accompany it, only that sort of character, in whose pliant flexibility, the party finds rather a creature than a leader. There is, unquestionably, a necessity, where the party bases its claims upon certain principles, that those by whom they are to be represented, shall be known properly to entertain those principles; but the man of inferior capacity, whatever principles he may profess, cannot be justly said to be their proper exponent. He must frequently fall into the hands of those who share none of his responsibility; and who, in due degree with their consciousness of this immunity, will be unscrupulous in the exercise of a power, with the abuse of which no penalties are coupled. It is greatly to be feared, that all long-continued organizations of parties must survive their legitimate uses, and they must become tyrannies. In such cases, their representatives are really chosen because of their flexi-



bility, and the facility with which they can be employed for the cunningly-selfish, who, safely curtailed in the back ground, work, in safety, their puppets upon the stage in front. The principles of a party, however strenuously set forth in resolutions and harangues, will, under such conditions, have but little real exercise in action; and a nation will thus, forever, be employed in chasing the shadow, while losing all the substantials, of liberty. As a general rule, there is no safety for any people, unless under the guardianship of their legitimate leaders. The legitimate leaders of a people, are those, obviously, who possess the natural endowment, and have received the training necessary for the business of government. It is in minds thus endowed and trained, to be able duly to appreciate the condition, the genius, and the necessities a people; to see, with almost prophetic forecast, what the future shall unfold, and to prepare against the emergency; to develop the resources, designate the true interests, and suggest the saving and performing policy by which the whole country shall be moved; and to find more real pleasure—it being the especial work allotted to their gifts—in thus achieving, than in the enjoyment of any place or power, to which they may be elevated by society. Such men as Calhoun, Clay and Webster, were unquestionably in possession of these endowments, yet, almost from the beginning of their public career, we have seen how fruitless was the aim of their admirers to raise either of them to the presidency. Inferior men—inferior as well in character as in intellect—were invariably thrust before them; and this, as the natural result of party organization; and, we have no doubt, in frequent opposition to the popular choice, could that have been left unbiassed. In the case of Mr. Calhoun, struggling, as he did, on behalf of the feeblest section of the Union, and with no half-measures—never temporizing with power, nor compromising the interests of his country, in a studious labour to assert his own—we have, at a glance, the secret of his failure to rise into the highest place in the government. At no period in his career, did the claims of party persuade him to a disregard of those which belonged to the necessities of his section. With Clay and Webster, the case was something different; but there is little question that the embarrassing influences which have kept them from the summits of power, are to be found in their great

mental superiority. They were not willing creatures. They were possessed of an individuality which could not be merged in that of party ; and *availableness*, in a candidate, was a word which signified, not only the utter want of saliency in his endowments, but the extreme pliability by which he was to be moulded to the purposes of those whose aims were the ascendancy of a faction, rather than the principles of a people. In this we have the secret of Mr. Polk's nomination. His success was due to the Texas question. His name was new in this connection ; his preferences were unknown, and his character, as understood by former associates in Congress and elsewhere, rendered it easy to suppose, without any disparagement to his merely moral qualities, that he was not the man to embarrass his party by the assertion of any querulous individual independence.

Nor was this choice, at the present juncture, of a kind to involve, in any real danger, the interests or principles of the country. The leading measures of the party were clearly understood, had been well argued, and did not need any leading mind for their analysis and discovery. It was no longer necessary that eloquence or philosophy should struggle for their development. The issues upon them were made up between the two parties, and the struggle was now to attain the ascendancy among the people. The democratic articles of faith, as adopted at the convention by which Polk was nominated, were all fairly written out. They insisted upon the limited powers of the general government ; upon a strict construction of the constitution ; denied the power to the government, of carrying out any general system of internal improvements ; denied the protective policy ; insisted upon rigid economy ; that revenue should only be raised to meet the absolutely necessary expenses of government ; denied that Congress had any power to charter a national bank ; to interfere with the domestic institutions of the States ; insisted upon the separation of the public moneys from banking institutions ; upon the proper application, to national objects, of the public lands ; asserted the value and necessity of the veto power in the President ; proclaimed our title to the whole of Oregon ; and declared for the annexation of Texas.

These resolutions, some of which were very vaguely habited in language, constituted a body of faith, which,



as it was generally recognized and understood by the democratic party no longer needed an exponent—needed only a representative. The party had arrived at its full doctrine, and the only struggle which remained was the acquisition of power under it. Had the doctrine been still of doubtful value, it would have required philosophy in the statesman. As it was, the mere politician could better answer the purpose, as better practised in the smaller arts by which the masses may be led and the selfish pacified. It is thus that parties may find their excuse for the rejection of their ablest men, and the adoption of their most feeble.

Mr. Polk was feeble, but not unworthy. It may be said that, with but one or two exceptions, he kept faith with his party. He deserves this credit; and, in thus deserving, he merits to share in the reputation of an administration which was certainly crowned with successes as brilliant as any in our national history.

His cabinet was chosen shrewdly. He committed a discourtesy in the dismissal of Mr. Calhoun from the office of Secretary of State, at a moment when he had made a large progress in the negotiations with Great Britain, on the subject of Oregon. Mr. C. should have been allowed to finish that negotiation. Otherwise, the cabinet of Mr. Polk was characterized by strength rather than greatness or nobility. His secretaries were rather shrewd and knowing, than great men. Most of them had experience in the affairs of the country, and much more in the affairs of party. It is rather amusing to read the grandiloquent description which Mr. Chase gives of them individually. Mr. Buchanan, who is a sensible but phlegmatic person, he describes as

“Logical and sound in his reasoning, with a sagacity which could discover dangers in the future, and the ability to avoid them, however threatening and sudden their approach, he was always a formidable foe to meet. His diplomatic communications gave evidence of thorough preparation, and in every conflict between himself and the representatives of foreign powers, *they retired, confounded and discomfited, before his unanswerable arguments.* His judgment was sound and comprehensive, and his mind was enriched by a course of long and painful study. In the Senate, he never wielded the glittering blade of Clay, nor the ponderous falchion of Webster. But whenever he addressed that body, it was *with a majesty of diction, an amplitude of information, and an iron and irresistible*

*strength of reasoning*, which seldom failed to convince where it did not control. He was as successful in the cabinet as he had been in the Senate, and *his vast powers* were ever equal to the responsibilities which devolved upon the department of State, while his opinions were always received with marked attention in cabinet council. The policy which he undeviatingly advocated, in the settlement of our difficulties with England and Mexico, was bold and decisive; *while the delicate position he occupied, in relation to the interests of Pennsylvania, after the course which he pursued in the campaign of 1844, rendered him somewhat timid upon the great domestic question of free trade.*"

We have italicised portions of this description, the absurdities of which the reader will detect for himself. That he should be timid in the matter of free trade, in consequence of the course which he pursued in the campaign of 1844—as our biographer mentions—is suggestive of some curious doubts, which it might be indelicate to urge. But, it is to be feared that Mr. Buchanan's explanations to the people of Pennsylvania, of the article of the democratic faith which goes against a protective tariff, were of a very different nature from those which were given in notoriously free trade regions. On this subject, Mr. Chase says, mincingly,

"It was asserted by the whigs that the Northern democracy touched lightly upon the question of annexation, and inscribed upon their flags the motto of "Polk, Dallas, and *the Tariff of 1842!*"

We trust that Mr. Buchanan's skirts are free in this respect, in spite of the insinuation of Mr. Chase, who evidently designs to speak him kindly.

Mr. Robert J. Walker, another Pennsylvanian, is not less honoured by the eulogies of our historian. We must follow him with our italics in this description also.

"He possessed solidity, without being brilliant, and, always exhausting the subject which he was investigating, he rarely failed to produce an impression upon the Senate. It was only when he was aroused by the magnitude of the subject under discussion, that he employed all that was gorgeous, yet pointed, in the arts of oratory. At such moments, his sarcasm and irony told with great effect upon his adversary. Ordinarily, however, his power consisted in argumentation, and in that field he had but few equals. It was chiefly upon his labours as Secretary of the Treasury, that he will rest his claims to an enduring fame. It was in that department that he employed all the energies of his nature, and the resources of *his vast and varied acquirements* in the advocacy of free trade."



Walker, we are told, in one breath, is *solid without being brilliant*—in the next, he is *gorgeous and pointed* in the arts of oratory. We see, in fact, the same strain of wordy, windy eulogy, in regard to him, as to Buchanan—our author being resolute to expend a certain amount of glorification upon his subject, without being able to determine wisely whether he should stick his feathers into the head or the tail. We trust that the reader will transfer them from one region to the other, wherever he thinks they will show to most advantage. Mr. Walker, in more homely language, was a clever financier, acute and adroit, was in full possession of the free trade argument, and used his figures to the best advantage. He was a financier—at best a politician—with some intelligence, and quite as much cunning; but no statesman. He is one of those Northern politicians, with Southern principles, who are daily riveting the fetters upon the necks of his adopted country. Let us give him credit, however, for a proper maintenance of his faith, while in office, to the principles of the democratic party.

Marcy, as Secretary of War, was probably one of the strongest and shrewdest of Polk's cabinet. Of him, Mr. Chase speaks in less extravagant, but more becoming language, than of his associates. As he says little or nothing amiss of Marcy, we shall quote nothing that he says. We may add, however, what Mr. Chase seems to have forgotten, that, if one of the ablest, Marcy was probably one of the least scrupulous of the cabinet. Shrewd, sagacious, dexterous, the manner in which he beguiled poor Scott into the silly correspondence which destroyed him, is a sufficient proof of the native adroitness of the man, and of his large experience in the school of New-York politics.

Of Bancroft, the writer of a history of the United States, an old federalist, ground over and made an apostle of recent democracy, Mr. Chase gives us the following portrait:

“His selection by Mr. Polk, as one of the members of his cabinet, was not only a proper tribute to his *vast and varied acquirements* as a scholar, but to his ability as a man. *Deeply versed in the lore of ancient and modern times*, his writings display evidences of *profound thought and thorough study*; and, *without possessing transcendent abilities, or a brilliant genius*, his works bear evidence of

careful preparation, and logical and argumentative power. As a speaker, his manner is not prepossessing. Nature has not favoured him with a rich and melodious voice, or a dignified and attractive presence. But the *gorgeous imagery and the sparkling gems which ornament his language, gild the philosophical thought and classical erudition*, and display the intellectual wealth which years of research have enabled him to acquire."

We fear that our readers may grow somewhat nauseated at the want of discrimination and variety which our author shows, when he deals in the language of laudation. "Vast and varied acquirements" were assigned to Mr. Walker, as well as Mr. Bancroft; and, to tell us, in one sentence, that the subject possesses neither "transcendent abilities nor a brilliant genius," yet say, in the very same paragraph, that he has the facility of employing "gorgeous imagery and sparkling gems, with which to gild his philosophical thought and classical erudition," is surely to say two very opposite things. Gorgeously imagery and sparkling gems are only to be wrought by the hands of the brilliant genius. Mr. Bancroft was once styled a humbug, by the venerable Mr. Ritchie. It is not always that we rely upon the judgment of Mr. Ritchie; but we are willing, in this instance, that it should go for what it is worth. We have no doubt that he knows Mr. Bancroft as well as any man.

It is upon Mr. Cave Johnson, the Post-Master General under Polk, that Mr. Chase expends most of his strength, as a painter of character. We must give this portrait at length, that those who have so frequently reviled Mr. Johnson, as a coarse, ignorant and incapable person, should be duly made ashamed of themselves. Hear our author :

"The Post Office department was filled by Cave Johnson, of Tennessee, who had been, for many years, *one of the most influential members of the House of Representatives*. He had obtained *great celebrity for his inflexible honesty, laborious industry, and for the vigilance with which he guarded the public treasury*. Gifted with *an integrity which was above suspicion*, he was a terror to all who are endeavouring to obtain the sanction of Congress to fraudulent claims; and, whenever his tall and venerable form was seen to rise for the purpose of addressing the House, in opposition to private claims, which were not founded in justice, the agents who had been preparing them knew that their fate was sealed. Perhaps no mem-



ber exercised so great an influence over the House of Representatives, during his congressional career, as Mr. Johnson. His long service in that body, his standing and ability, and *the argumentative and persuasive eloquence which characterized his speeches, always produced a remarkable effect upon that body.* Mild and courteous in his manner, he won the respect of his political opponents, while his unshaken attachment to his friends bound them to him by the warmest ties. The constancy of his affection for men was only surpassed by his devotion to principle; and nothing less than a thorough conviction of utter worthlessness would induce him to abandon a man whom he had once called his friend. As an orator, he was generally calm and argumentative, his prominent characteristic being *convincing and irresistible power.* He never studied the arts of declamation, and did not seek to gild his speeches with the *corruscations of genius.* A *splendid exordium and brilliant peroration cannot be found in one of his efforts.* He appealed to the reason, and not to the imagination, and always with effect. Yet, upon several occasions, when unwarrantable attacks were made upon him, or when his indignation was aroused by conduct which he reprobated, *his retorts were terrible, and his anathemas annihilating.* Upon such occasions, *his majestic form towered,* and his stern glance was fixed upon the offender, who *writhed beneath the biting and withering sarcasms which were poured from the lips of the speaker.* With a facility of illustration, and a fiery and impassioned eloquence, he returns again and again to the assault, until his *blasting irony has pierced the shield in which the delinquent supposed himself encased, and he lies, prostrate and bleeding, before the indignant orator."*

There! if such an eulogium does not make the reader properly remorseful for any disrespectful notions which have hitherto entered his brain, or fallen from his lips, in respect to Mr. Cave Johnson, we give him up to the awful keeper of the second region in Dante's Inferno, leaving him to the dragon-folds of Minos, and the tender mercies of his province. He deserves no better fate. It is to be feared, however, that, so long as he remains on earth, his impression will be, that either Mr. Chase designs, in this paragraph, a very exquisite piece of irony, or that he has made some very curious mistakes in respect to his subject, particularly as regards his literature and eloquence. His integrity we have no reason to question; and, reading here with what bull dog tenacity he kept watch over the treasury, and what a terror he was to those who sought to find illegal entrance to the public money, we certainly lament his absence, at the present juncture, from a place where he is so much wanted.

Of John Y. Mason, Attorney General for a season, and subsequently Secretary of the Navy, the praise of Mr. Chase is somewhat equivocal. He represents him rather as a good bottle companion than a statesman. "This gentleman is the very soul of conviviality." He has no grand phrases about Mason. A good fellow, says he, of sound judgment enough, but small industry. An excellent fellow enough at a feast, and quite popular, accordingly. This is the amount of what he says, in more cautious language. One sentence, however, we must not omit. "He possessed a thorough knowledge of the masses, and was, *therefore*, a safe cabinet counsellor." The *sequitur*, here, is deserving of study. It is something for the future statesman to understand, that the great requisite for a cabinet counsellor is, not books of law, or history, or studies in politics, or statistics, or government; but a familiar acquaintance with Tom, Dick and Harry, and the other good fellows with whom they congregate. Certainly, a new lesson in statesmanship.

Of Clifford and Toucey, who also occupied at different periods the seat of Attorney-General in Polk's Cabinet, our author has a good word, but one only. We shall emulate his forbearance as far as concerns these excellent persons, one of whom, by the way, was a Commissioner to Mexico, and blundered in respect to a certain protocol. Both of them seem to have been persons of very moderate ability.

With the Government thus organized, with a very respectable, if not powerful Cabinet, Mr. Polk began his career of administration. His first message fairly embodied the principles and policy under which he had received his nomination from the Baltimore Convention. The first leading subject which he set before Congress, was the unfinished business of the previous administration in regard to the annexation of Texas. The next question of importance, was that of the settlement of the boundary between the United States and Great Britain, the former claiming to possess a clear and undisputable right Oregon, embracing the whole territory between the parallels of 42° and 54° 40'. We shall consider this last history first, as the one which most stringently pressed upon Polk's administration; and, fortunately, the first which found final adjustment.

It was one of the declarations of the Baltimore Demo-



cratic Convention, that our right was unquestionable to the whole of Oregon. It was one of the blunders of Mr. Polk, that he conceived himself bound to establish, at any hazard, all the claims and opinions which this Convention had declared. Now, many of the excellent gentlemen who acted in this Convention, had not the smallest notion that in all things they were to be literally understood. It is to be feared that a considerable number of those present were governed much less by the principles which they professed, than the party which they managed. The success of the latter was an object quite too important to make them give much heed to the former; and professions of faith were made, not so much with the design that they should be put in action, as in the hope to secure certain support for party, from certain sections, for whose benefit they were particularly devised. It was known that the wild democracy of the west had an enormous appetite for territory, illustrated forcibly by Mr. Cass in the United States Senate, who avowed a sufficient capacity of stomach to take in the whole of Mexico. The end, among the very knowing ones, was sufficiently obtained, when, under the *profession* of the principle, the success of the party was secured in the choice of its candidates. It was Mr. Polk's error to suppose that he was required literally to carry out that which had been, literally enough, incorporated among the articles of the party faith. He took the principle avowed, on trust, withdrew the proposition which had been made to the British Government, and boldly declared our title to the whole of Oregon. This, says Mr. Chase, who better understood the working of the wires, "was a fatal error," which had "the effect of alienating some of his (Mr. Polk's) warmest friends," and "greatly embarrassed his administration." Yet, Mr. Chase adds that, in asserting our title as unquestionable to the whole of Oregon, Mr. Polk "was but reiterating the opinions of his constituents, solemnly expressed at the ballot box." There is something to be considered here. Mr. Chase, is himself a little too literal now. It will not do to insist that the voters at large deliberately fasten upon all the doctrines laid down by party leaders, and tenaciously require their fulfilment. The commentary on this assumption, with regard to the popular adherence to these professions of party,—nay, in respect even to the popular familiarity with them—is to be

found at page 15 of Mr. Chase's volume, where he slyly tells us that the supporters of Polk and Dallas, in Pennsylvania, allied, with these good democratic names, the words "and the Tariff of 1842,"—which our good Democratic leaders at the Convention had absolutely repudiated. So much for the detailed professions of faith, of party organization, delivered to the populace. And so, in respect to Oregon. Of all the managing politicians engaged in the business of the Convention, but a very few of them were so simple as to suppose that the expression of opinion was destined to be literally carried out in action. The verdancy of Mr. Polk was annoying enough to the more sagacious, and hence the "alienation of his friends," and the "embarrassments of his administration."

Now, we are among those who believe that our right to the whole of Oregon, was, really, in the language of Mr. Polk, equally "clear and unquestionable." Indeed, the British claim to any absolute rights in the soil, is only a recent one. In the first blush of the question, they pretended only to a temporary right of occupancy; and had there been any exigency, rendering the territory necessary to us, it would have been seized by our Government and held with the strong arm twenty years ago. The blunder of Mr. Polk lay in construing a prospective into a present possession, and forcing an issue, in the absence of any necessity, by which, in fact, we incurred a forfeiture of territory. The wise counsel of Mr. Calhoun, embodied in the well known phrase of "masterly inactivity," contained the whole secret of a policy which would ultimately secure us the whole country of Oregon. Every day was increasing our strength and resources in that region, and diminishing proportionately the strength and resources of Great Britain. Every season beheld our border population, our hardy hunters and adventurers, passing into the waste regions, and extending our actual possession of the soil. There was no sort of need to precipitate events. A few years, probably less than a generation, would have found the treasure, like so much ripe fruit, falling of itself, into our laps. Great Britain foresaw this as well as we did, and was quiet—nay, was quite content that it should be so;—and, in the process of years, a perfectly amicable arrangement, the result of her necessity, would have given it to us, just as soon as it was important that we should have the use of it. But Great Britain was not to be kicked

or bullied into its surrender. Her safety, as a living power, not less than her pride, as a great nation, denied that she should have the country torn with violence from her grasp ; and, on this issue, however deplored by her,—and, we may add, deplorable to her also,—she would have fought with all the desperate strength of the leviathan. Silently and sternly she prepared herself for this necessity and duty, and the negotiations, as conducted on her side, were distinguished by a coolness and temperate resolve, which lessened in no degree the strength of her argument.

How was it on ours ? Without preparation or precaution, our wilder and more reckless politicians were forcing the nation headlong to extremities which were due neither to our rights, our policy, or our necessities. Believing that, in a large section of our country, the popular mind was resolved on making the question a leading point, all those among our public men, who aimed at future political power, were constrained to yield to the assumed popular impulse. The balance of power lay in the hands of the people of the West, and they were disposed to use it for compelling, at any hazard, the acquisition of the whole of Oregon. They were comparatively indifferent to the probable event of war, as they were wholly unassailable by the enemy. A war with Great Britain would fall entirely upon the commerce and commercial cities of the Atlantic and Gulph coasts of the country, and we were to incur the possible destruction of these, in the pursuit of a barren territory, wholly needless to our present wants, and which, in the course of a very few seasons, would naturally fall into our hands. Under these circumstances, nothing could be more humiliating than the miserable strife among our politicians in Congress, as to who should show most desperate earnestness in the assertion of our right to the whole of Oregon. It became a game of brag with whig and democrat alike, each being resolute not to be outbid, in the effort to secure the support of the belligerent West ; and the deportment of Congress, for a time, showed us, not simply determined to acquire the disputed territory, but eager to couple the acquisition with as much indignity as possible to Great Britain. Fortunately, the South,—selfishly as Mr. Chase charges—threw its weight into the scale against this insane sort of statemanship. The “Southern representatives gave indications of a willing-



ness to surrender a portion of the territory, to destroy the growing ascendancy of the North." This was certainly a sufficient motive ; but Mr. Chase is ignorant, if not unjust, to assume that the South was wanting in higher motives. The moral sense revolts at all war that is not founded upon the strict necessity of a nation—the necessity of securing itself from assault, spoliation, or the loss of character. Nothing of the kind could be apprehended to us from the continuance of our arrangement with Great Britain, for the mutual occupancy of the disputed region. We were daily gaining more perfect foothold, and, in fact, a quiet possession of the country ; and, in the nature of things, the end must have been our complete mastery of the domain. The final action by which the rupture was threatened, was on our part. We gave notice to Great Britain that our arrangement should cease, and at once assumed an attitude of threatening and defiance. It was fortunate, indeed, for the peace of the world, that the South interposed with the calm wisdom which finally prevailed. Speaking of her course and that of the North, Mr. Chase remarks :

"The characteristics of the members from the two great sections seemed to have changed, and *impassioned eloquence and fiery denunciation breathed through every sentence* which was uttered by the representatives from the Northern States ; while a temporizing, if not a timid policy, controlled many of the representatives from the South."

It is astonishing how gross and flatulent the voice of eulogy becomes in our country. To apply the words "fiery and impassioned eloquence," to the vapory, windy, brawling, and too frequently brutal language employed by these "red sticks" of the Congress of the United States, in this discussion, is certainly a most atrocious abuse of language ; but we have seen from previous extracts, how naturally this inflated phraseology comes to our author. The result of the vote in the House on the "joint resolution of notice to Great Britain" to annul the Convention between its Government and that of the United States, was carried, in the House, by 163 affirmative, to 54 negative votes. The Senate amended the resolution, so as to change its character, making it discretionary with the President, where the House made it mandatory, to give the proposed notice. A conference took place between the two houses, and the amendment of the Senate, in sub-

stance, finally prevailed. The friends of the administration were by no means satisfied with this amendment, but had to submit. The fact is, that, although Mr. Chase asserts the contrary, there were not a few among them who felt but little "reliance in the firmness and decision of the Executive." They knew, in fact, that the infirmity in Mr. Polk's character was really of this sort—and that he was not the man eagerly to seek for occasions of responsibility. Finally, when the offer was made to the President, by the British Minister, to settle the question upon the basis of the proposition previously submitted by Mr. Polk in 1845, he gave sufficient proof of the fact that his ambition was by no means martyrdom. He threw the responsibility of deciding upon the Senate, declaring his purpose to accept or reject the proposition, just as they should advise; a proceeding quite conclusive that the young, was a very puny off-shoot from the trunk of the "Old Hickory." According to his more furious followers, the 54° 40' men, he should have flung back the proposition in the teeth of the British Minister, and sounded the tocsin to the country. Mr. Chase, with every disposition to do honor to his hero, and assert his excellence, is yet compelled to say that "*the nerves which had remained unmoved during many political struggles, and the firmness which had overcome the most fiery opposition, where the cheeks of the resolute and bold blanched with terror, were shaken at the prospect of a rupture with Great Britain, unsanctioned by one branch of the legislative power.*"

We are at a loss to assign the previous periods to which our author refers, when he speaks of the terrific scenes, so fearful to other hearts, through which the nerves of Mr. Polk carried him so triumphantly; but we are quite willing that his period should be rounded with these potential phrases. They belong to a sort of eloquence for which his preference seems to be very much decided. The result was that we lost some five degrees of territory, at least, when we should have lost none. A loss that was strictly the consequence of Mr. Polk's precipitance,—his blundering construction of a resolution which designed nothing more than a profession, which the veterans of the Convention never meant should be perilled by any sort of practical use or application. The course prescribed by Mr. Calhoun would, in the end, and quite as soon as necessary, have secured us all the territory in question.

It was lost wholly by the anxiety of Mr. Polk to make so much political capital out of the subject. That the South should be no ways anxious, in the present destructive temper of the Northern mind, to add to the quantity of free soil territory, is scarcely to be made her reproach; and all pretext of reproach ceases in consideration of the fact that the true policy, even for the acquisition, lay in the judicious forbearance that left the matter in abeyance until we were ready to occupy the region. Ultimately, in all probability, the territory thus lost, will be recovered. The principle avowed by Mr. Monroe, which declared that "the American Continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power," is conclusive that such territory cannot avail materially in any way to the purposes of Great Britain. Our foothold on the Pacific, the increase of our commerce, and the relative decline of that of Great Britain,—all of which is inevitable, unless our confederacy is split to pieces—(of which the present prospect is not inconsiderable)—render it very certain that we shall yet possess to the magic limits of 54° 40'. We confess ourselves willing to wait the event.

The next subject of leading political importance in Mr. Polk's administration, was the completion of the measures which had been begun by his predecessor for the annexation of Texas, and the final union of that republic with ours. This was an event, equally important in itself and in its consequences. Our author affords us a sufficiently copious body of details in connection with it. Somewhat unnecessarily, we think, he devotes a long chapter to the history of the Mexican revolution, by which the rule of Spain was thrown off, and to a subsequent sketch of leading events in the progress of Mexico down to the population of the State of Texas. We do not see that this history is at all essential to the consideration of the causes leading to our recent war with Mexico. Nor is it at all important to insist that the territory of Texas was originally ours to the banks of the Rio Grande. It is enough that we waived or yielded up our rights by treaty, that the act was acquiesced in by our people, and, by our own hands and seals, that we precluded ourselves from saying a word more upon the subject. All our rights subsequently accrued through Texas, and in consequence of the annexa-



tion of that State to the United States. The fourth chapter of our author, which gives us the history of the relations of the Texans with Central Mexico, from the period of the confederacy of 1824, to the period of Texian independence, is objectionable for the same reason. It is mere surplusage, not essential to the question, and to be found in a hundred other more appropriate histories. It is enough for us that we found Texas a state *de facto*,—independent, recognized as such, and amply proving her capacity, by arms and men, to maintain her independence. Her rights *de jure*, or as a legitimate power, are clearly inferrible from this condition, and from the recognition of other leading powers of the world.

It was perhaps quite as well that our author should deny the imputations of the Mexicans, and our jealous British contemporaries, who charge upon the people of the United States, a long meditated plan for dispossessing the “magnanimous” republic of its Texian territory. That a previous administration should have sought its purchase, through Mr. Poinsett, affords no authority for the assertion. No doubt the territory was highly desirable as a frontier to our Southern States; and it was quite natural that the most far-sighted of our statesmen should have urged the importance of its acquisition. But no one in the United States, people or politician, ever dreamed of the usurpation of the soil. It was proposed to purchase it, and the reasons for the sale were, or should have been, quite as conclusive to the Mexicans, as were the motives to purchase on the part of our people. To the Mexicans it was worse than useless—a region possessed by savages,—which Mexico could neither compass by its settlements, nor conquer by its arms. The native Indians were a formidable race, whose very appearance struck terror to the souls of the miserable inhabitants of the frontier cities along the Rio Grande. From this waste realm, they rushed down at seasons upon the peaceful and timid inhabitants of Northern Mexico, seizing their property and carrying their women and children into a most hopeless captivity. The presence of an Anglo-Saxon Colony in this region, would be necessarily to afford the feeble borderers along the Rio Grande, a degree of security which the Central Government of Mexico had shown itself unwilling or unable to bestow; and it was because of a reasoning of this nature that the government of

Mexico invited the Anglo-Americans to occupy the debatable land, under favourable grants, with their armed colonies. The policy was a sound one, but one which did by no means comport with the equal pride and weakness of the Mexicans. It was securing themselves against the savages, but at the expense of their territory. It afforded them safety, but at the cost of their self esteem. The province rose in value, in Mexican eyes, as a due consequence of its increased and increasing profit and security, in the hands of the Northern Americans. That the Texians should set up for themselves, was but the natural fruit of their moral superiority as a race. They were not a people to be ruled, by the vain, flippant and unprincipled chieftains, the Guerreros', Bustamantes', Aristas' and Ampudias', who maintained themselves in a capricious power at the expense of the vital energies of the country. That the Texians should shake off the feeble rule of Mexico, as soon as their numbers enabled them to do so, and under the first provocation, might have been predicted by the most ordinary foresight. It did not need the help or the participation of the United States to prompt them to their independence, or sustain them in securing it; and, as a government, we were singularly forbearing,—much more so than would have been the case with Great Britain, or France, or any European power. That the Texians defrauded of their chartered rights by the Mexicans, and assailed by their arms, should seek to coalesce with the States from which they had gone forth, was equally certain; but their efforts at this object were really discouraged by the United States. The administration of President Jackson,—who was quite as anxious for the possession of the territory as any individual could be,—rejected, in 1836, the proposition to this effect, made by the people of Texas. The final event was precipitated by the faithlessness and folly of the Mexicans themselves, and by the insolent interference of the European powers. In brief, it had become a national necessity; and, so far as Mexico was concerned, was perfectly justified by the consideration that she had nothing left of the disputed territory to lose. Texas was in possession, and had declared her sovereignty over the soil to the banks of the Rio Grande, and had maintained either real or constructive possession of all the region for several years.

In seeking to acquire this territory, the government of the United States was influenced by the necessity of keeping Texas from any close or dependant alliance with any European powers. The Southern States were particularly interested, not only by the policy of adding to the political power of the slave section, but in extending its boundaries. Higher considerations were at work, also, in the popular mind, working there as instincts rather than as thoughts, and looking forward to the inevitable progress of our system of federative government over the whole American continent. Under our system, of a league of States, the powers of the government are not liable to any lessening from any extent of territorial acquisition. The beautiful influence by which the States, through their reserved rights, check the tendency to a consolidated government, affords the most happy security to all the States, however remote from the centre; and the strength of the government is increased, rather than diminished, by the annexation of new States, so long as you keep down the tendency to centralism, and thus afford to the feebler and remoter States a guaranty for the security of their individual rights and institutions. It scarcely needs, however, that we should discuss this policy, now sufficiently settled by the practice of the country for thirty years, and the approving voice of most of our ablest politicians. Mr. Polk, on going into power, had before him the imperative pledge, on this subject, of the Baltimore convention, and the more conclusive instructions of the people, as implied in the vote which enabled him to triumph over Mr. Clay. He instantly resumed the negotiations, or rather consummated the proceedings, which had been begun by Mr. Tyler. We are not quite satisfied with the manner in which Mr. Chase dismisses Mr. Tyler's administration. It savours of contempt, and is ungrateful, coming from one who represents the democratic party. With all Mr. Tyler's errors, and we do not deny them—particularly that first, so fortunate for us, in which he allowed himself to be associated, under equivocal terms, with a whig President—we are bound to say that he was faithful, while in office, to the Southern people and the democratic party. We must do him the meagre justice of making this acknowledgement, and, we may further add, that a history of his administration, honestly written, would, now that he is no longer a claimant for popular favour, re-



dound honourably to his reputation. Such a history would be a proper introduction to the present, and would accord to Mr. Tyler some considerable portion of that credit, on the subject of the annexation of Texas, which we should unjustly assign entirely to the administration of Mr. Polk. In fact, Mr. Tyler, through Mr. Calhoun, as his Secretary of State, contributed largely to the creation of that political capital, which, ensuring to the democratic party, achieved its final successes over their opponents.

With the conclusion of the treaty between the government of the United States and that of Texas, Mexico took measures for war. Her politicians, having previously aroused all the prejudices and passions of the ignorant people whom they swayed so capriciously, found it their policy, in pursuit of power, to resolve on the extremest issues. The war was begun by Mexico. Her orders were issued, to this effect, as we know by her own documents, in advance of Taylor's march to Corpus Christi. The pretext, that his movement to the Rio Grande precipitated that event, is thus shown to be a pretext merely. Mr. Polk was anxious to avert this conflict. The American consul, at Mexico, was instructed to open negotiations with that power, and a commissioner was sent to Mexico, under the previously expressed readiness of its government to receive him. But, on the absurd pretence that the powers of Mr. Slidell were those of a minister plenipotentiary, and not those of a commissioner for a single specific purpose, the persons in temporary authority in that country refused to receive him. They continued to raise troops. Paredes, known to be hostile to the United States, and alledged to be friendly to the erection of the republic into a monarchy, and the elevation of a European sovereign to the throne, succeeded in revolutionizing the government, superseding Herrera in his administration. Orders followed soon, directing the Mexican generals on the northern frontier to attack the American army of Occupation, and the spirit of the whole nation was evidently governed by the most hostile purposes. They were encouraged to this course by the opposition, in the American Congress, to the policy of Mr. Polk. The arguments which they urged were furnished by the partisan warfare against our administration. Those who were hostile to the admission of Texas, as a slave State, insisted that the country beyond the Nueces was not Texian but

Mexican territory, and that, by compassing this territory with our troops, we gave Mexico a provocation such as would not result from the mere act of annexation, and which justified her in the resort to arms. As this question, of the boundaries of Texas, has been made the subject of a recent and monstrous usurpation by the United States, we quote, from the volume before us, a conclusive extract, from a letter of the Hon. Volney E. Howard, in regard to it, and which discusses the subject in a way equally complete and comprehensive.

“The claim of Texas to the whole Rio Grande, from its mouth to its source, and to the 42d degree of north latitude, will never be contested by any intelligent lawyer, who takes the trouble to investigate the grounds upon which it rests. There is no greater fallacy than that of supposing that the United States succeeded to the rights of Mexico in any portion of the territory east of the Rio Grande. Between the republic of Texas and the United States, the question of boundary was settled, finally and conclusively, by the convention of 1838, which received the sanction of the legislative departments of both governments. The treaty with Spain, of 1818, fixed the northern boundary between Spain and the United States, at the 42d parallel of latitude. The treaty of 1828 revived that boundary between the United States and Mexico, reciting that the treaty of 1819 was binding upon Mexico. The convention between Texas and the United States, of 1838, recited that the treaty with Mexico, of 1828, ‘is binding upon the republic of Texas, the same having been entered into at a time when Texas formed a part of the said United Mexican States. And, whereas, it is deemed proper and expedient, in order to prevent future disputes and collisions between the United States and Texas, in regard to *the boundary between the two countries, as designated by the treaty*, that a portion of the same shall be run and marked, without unnecessary delay,’ &c. This convention was ratified and carried out by the act of the United States Congress, of January 11th, 1839, under which the eastern boundary of Texas was actually run and marked, by the two governments, as far as the 34th degree of north latitude. The very act under which this convention was negotiated, upon the part of Texas, was her boundary act of 1846, by which her boundary is declared to be the Rio Grande, to its source; and thence to the 42d degree of north latitude; and thence, east and south, according to the boundary formerly existing between the United States and Mexico. This convention was an express recognition of the entire boundary of Texas, and made with reference to the act of the Texas Congress of 1836. Whatever might have been its effect upon Mexico, this convention is forever *conclusive* of the boundary, as



against the United States, by an act as solemn as a treaty stipulation.

“The Texas act of boundary, together with other laws, not inconsistent with the constitution of the United States, the resolutions of annexation, or the constitution of the State, was declared in force by the constitution under which she was admitted into the Union, and therefore ratified by the Congress of the United States.

“Texas was admitted into the Union with specified boundaries, subject only to the right of the United States to settle ‘all questions of boundary which may arise with other governments’—meaning, of course, governments other than the United States. This was a naked power, coupled with no interest, which must be strictly construed. Under it, the Texas boundary, with any foreign government, might have been settled. But, as the late treaty with Mexico removed the possibility of such a question with any *other* government, the power is at an end. Neither could the United States, thus acting as the trustee of Texas, to settle the boundary with other governments, acquire of any government a right in opposition to the claim of Texas. To assert such a proposition, is to affirm that the trustee may become the subject-matter of the trust, in opposition to the beneficiary; or that the judge, or arbitrator, may adjudge the subject of controversy to himself, in opposition to the parties litigant. It is evident, that, whatever right the United States acquired, under the treaty with Mexico, to the country east of the Rio Grande, was acquired as the trustee of Texas, and enures to the benefit of that State.

“The United States, having neglected to settle the boundary in the treaty with Mexico, have now no constitutional power to change or alter the boundary of Texas, any more than that of any other sovereign State. It was admitted, in the case of Maine, that this government, without the consent of Maine, could not negotiate for less than the *claim* of Maine. In his remarks on the resolutions of annexation, in the Senate, February 5th, 1845, Col. Benton said: ‘In fact, when once admitted as a State, she (Texas) never can be reduced, without her consent. The constitution forbids it.’ Having given her consent to the alteration only in a particular manner, it cannot be effected in any different method.

“The joint resolutions of annexation evidently intended that the whole of new Mexico, on the east bank of the Rio Grande, should be embraced within the State of Texas, because they give three guaranties, applicable to this very country: 1. That Texas may be subdivided into five States. 2. That in any State south of 36° 30’ (the Missouri compromise line,) slavery may exist, at the option of the people of the same. 3. That in any State, or States, to be formed north of that line, slavery is prohibited. Now, the Missouri compromise line divides the country formerly comprised in New

Mexico, east of the Rio Grande, nearly centrally—Santa Fé being situated in about latitude  $35^{\circ} 45'$  north. It is incomprehensible that the Congress of the United States should have thus provided for the domestic government of this very territory, as a part of Texas, if it was in Mexico, and not in Texas. By what right could the United States, in a compact with Texas, assume to regulate the government of a department of Mexico, and make rules for its admission, as a State, into the American Union? The resolutions of annexation, *in terms*, define the boundaries of Texas, to the extent of one or more States, north of  $36^{\circ} 30'$ . They assert expressly, that to this extent the country rightfully belongs to Texas, and is included within her limits. And the limit of one State, thus given, will include the whole of New Mexico east of the Rio Grande. There is a fourth guarantee, given by the compact of annexations, as applicable to this territory east of the Rio Grande. If a new State is not formed wholly to the north of  $36^{\circ} 30'$ , slavery exists in Texas to the 42d degree of north latitude. It exists, at present, under the constitution with which the State was admitted into the Union. When Texas was admitted, by her law, slavery existed to her utmost extent, and no restraint was placed upon it by the resolutions of annexation, but the prospective provision, to operate in case a State was formed north of  $36^{\circ} 30'$ . Nay, more, the resolutions give another guarantee, not only to Texas, but to her creditors, as applicable to this territory, in pledging her public lands to the payment of her public debt.

“The boundaries of Texas, as above mentioned, were defined in the treaty with Santa Anna, which was a valid treaty, because he represented a government not only *de facto*, but *de jure*—the federal constitution having been overturned, and the States reduced to departments; all of which, together with his authority, were ratified by the Congress of Mexico, in 1835. Nor was the treaty affected by the fact that Santa Anna was a prisoner of war at the time of its execution, because it was executed by his generals, who were not prisoners, and especially by Filisola, upon whom, by law and special appointment, the authority of the command and the faculties of chief devolved. The treaty was valid, without the signature of Santa Anna; and Mexico, having acted on it, and received the benefit of its stipulations, could not, under the law of nations, repudiate it afterwards—certainly, not without returning the property and military stores which were secured to her by the treaty.

“Mexico, herself, virtually acknowledged the boundary of the treaty, by her truce of 1844, and ordered all the Mexican settlements a league beyond the Rio Grande to be broken up, and the inhabitants to fall back on the Rio Grande, treating all as traitors found beyond that line, at least on the lower Rio Grande. The Mexican commissioners, who negotiated the present treaty, have

admitted that the Rio Grande had been indicated as the boundary for twelve years. The American commissioner, Mr. Trist, in his correspondence with the Mexican government, asserted the boundaries of Texas, as claimed by herself. It is fair to presume that Mexico intended to provide for the treaty of 1836, with Texas, by making Disturnell's map, of 1847, a part of the treaty, and declaring it authentic; which map shows the whole of the country east of the Rio Grande to be in Texas, and New Mexico, as defined by the map, entirely situated west of that river. Thus, the New Mexico, acquired by the United States, is defined as situated west of the Rio Grande, by the treaty. Mexico has transferred nothing east of that river. She admitted, by the map, that she owned nothing on that side of the Rio Grande, at the time of the ratification of the treaty.'"

War having been begun between Mexico and the United States, the question which affects the claims of Mr. Polk naturally results from the inquiry into his mode of carrying on hostile operations. It seems to have been an error of the President, in despatching to the hostile frontier a force too inadequate to the purposes of conquest, and which rather invited than repelled the efforts of the enemy. So small an army as that of Taylor—scarcely three thousand men—so far from its base of operations, so removed from any prospect of immediate succours—was calculated to encourage rather than to overawe the Mexicans. It was a bait held out to their enterprise, and afforded some ground to the suspicion that it was thrown out for this purpose; the object being the acquisition of still more extended territory, which could be hoped for only under new provocations, afforded by the Mexicans. However plausible the suggestion, we wholly acquit Mr. Polk of a charge so monstrous. It is not improbable that some of his friends and counsellors entertained this object secretly; since farther political capital was to be accumulated, in reference to the period when, Mr. Polk having retired, a new struggle was to follow, for the success of the party and its new aspirants; and since it was well known that the great passion of our people was the acquisition of new domain. It is very certain that the bait, whether designed as such or not, readily took with the Mexicans. They naturally fancied it to be easy to overwhelm with numbers so feeble a body of assailants. The vulgar prejudice, which made John Bull assume that one Briton was equal to three Frenchmen, and prompted Na-



poleon to estimate one Frenchman as fully worth three Austrians or Italians in conflict, had not so far possessed the Anglo-Americans or the Mexicans, as to suffer either of them to suppose that one of the former was quite equal to half a score of the latter. Very far otherwise. Indeed, there is little question that the Mexicans regarded themselves as by far the most warlike people of the two. They had certainly been engaged in a long quasi warfare among themselves, and had a catalogue of heroes, in comparison with which our collection was very meagre. Without arrogating to themselves a very large superiority—certainly none at all in the practice of war—the people of the United States were quite assured of their capacity to conquer their Southern neighbours. And this assumption was built, not so much upon their experience in war, as upon the natural superiority of the race, whose instincts, rather than their reason, inspired them with the fullest confidence to this effect. Nor, as we now know, were these instincts at fault. The Mexicans sought to overwhelm Taylor with their masses, having greatly the advantage, as well in numbers as in the general circumstances of the war. They better knew the territory. Their base of operations was at hand. They had the resources and the encouragements of their cities upon the Rio Grande, and of a tolerably numerous population; while a comparative desert lay between the Americans and their people. Including their irregulars, the militia or native guerillas of the country, it may be assumed that at no time had Arista and Ampudia less than ten thousand men in hand. At no time, in the conflict with Taylor, were their numbers less than three or four to one of the Americans. We know the result of the various trials of strength that took place along the Rio Grande. They have already received frequent consideration in our pages. The question occurs, having maintained himself in the Texian territory, was it proper or politic on the part of Taylor to cross the Rio Grande? This is one of those questions which concern the administration. If it were the object of the administration to coerce Mexico, but little could be done towards this object by a progress on Northern Mexico. As a diversion, simply, the movement was legitimate; but not because it afforded us possession of a profitless region, but because it had the effect of rendering necessary a division of the Mexicans' strength. The

plea, that Northern Mexico was disaffected to the central government, and might be detached readily, under the presence of an invading army, was an absurdity to all those who know anything of the Mexico-Spanish character, its malignant prejudices, national and religious, against the Americans, and the unprincipled and capricious despotism of the region. If Taylor's army was to serve as a diversion, while the main efforts of our armies were to be addressed to more vital parts of the Mexican territory, then the administration erred in not moving the main army, *pari passu*, with that of Taylor. Yet this was not the case, and though Taylor passed, with wondrous spirit and good fortune, from victory to victory, yet the results seem to have been quite barren of any thing but reputation. The determined valour of Taylor, his officers and men, saved the administration, as well as themselves, from defeat and shame; and the credit of the former, which had thus exposed them to the most fearful odds—if any credit be its due—must consist simply in its having made a just estimate of the powers of endurance, the courage of our troops, and the skill and spirit of their officers. But, in truth, the administration did not calculate on war. It miscalculated the spirit of the Mexicans. It aimed rather to overawe than to subdue; and, with this policy in view, blundered most atrociously in not using adequate efforts, in making such a demonstration, at the outset, as should attain fully the promised objects. Our fleets every where covering the Gulf, and watching the Mexican ports in that region and on the Pacific, with an army of five thousand men, at least, upon the Rio Grande, and it is probable that the work of negotiation would have superseded that of war.

The difficulties of the administration with Gen. Scott, which began at the first opening of the conflicts on the Rio Grande, are to be ascribed to causes wholly political. Gen. Scott was a favourite of the whig party, and the prospects of his nomination for the presidency, by that party, in the next canvas, were very considerable. That General Scott should have taken the command of the American army, in the event of war, was a matter of course. That he did not, is equally due to his own folly and the adroit hostility of the administration. Regarding himself as the favourite of the whig party, Gen. Scott was reluctant to leave the capital. It is due to him to

assume, on his part, a belief that the war was destined to be one of simple watchfulness, on both sides, or of outposts only. At the outset, our administration not only did not meditate carrying our arms to the heart of Mexico, but professed not to anticipate war at all. In this conjecture Scott seems to have shared. Had he dreamed of battles to be fought, and fields to be won, of any magnitude, it would have appealed equally to the soldier reputation of Scott, and to his policy, as one seeking the highest honours of the people, that he should have eagerly seized upon every opportunity of acquiring new laurels in the field. His passion for martial renown is not to be underrated; and his own knowledge of the American people was sufficient to assure him that military successes are, above all others, the very sort to secure the national favour. The administration charges upon Scott, that he was dilatory in his preparations, and somewhat extravagant in his estimates. These charges were probably true; but his dilatoriness may have arisen quite as much from the failing energies (which, in age, where the progress is not one of actual conflict, by which the blood excites the brain, are apt to always show themselves a little too deliberate) as from politics. Old generals, for this reason, are not often found successful, as leaders of invading armies. They are always much better employed in the defence of posts. All the successful invaders known to history achieved their conquests in their youth—Scipio, Alexander, Sylla, Pompey, Napoleon, etc. In the case of Scott and Taylor, we find neither of them reaping the full fruits of their victories. There was always a pause after their triumphs, in which the enemy found time to recover, repair their disasters, and compel an entire renewal of the work. There was no impulsive enthusiasm, by which the excited tone of the conquering army was used to complete the success, and take advantage of the subdued *morale* of a beaten and fugitive enemy. Divided thus, between the slowness natural to the veteran, and his reluctance to leave the political field to his enemies, Scott afforded the administration a fatal advantage. We have very little doubt, at first, that the administration was quite willing that Gen. Scott should forbear taking the active command of the army. It was a matter of course that he should be required to do so; but it was very well understood that his successes, if at all brilliant,



would be such as would inevitably confirm his claims to the presidency. When, therefore, his own indiscretion afforded an opportunity for taking the baton from his grasp, it was readily employed. Scott was probably the only person in the country who did not see this danger. His reference, in his letter to the secretary, (Marcy) to his political opponents in Washington—to “the fire in his rear”—was not less a folly than an impertinence. He had to do with a superior politician, in Marcy, who, no doubt, smiled grimly, and in silence, at the wild errors which placed the veteran chief completely in his power. The letter penned over a “hasty plate of soup” was probably penned under the influence of the champagne which accompanied it. It was not designed as an official letter. It was another error of Scott’s, to suppose that he could make a sort of compromise between his personal and official relations, and could write to Marcy at once as a good fellow and as secretary of war. It was an ungenerous abuse of this weakness that prompted the secretary to recognize wholly as official the communication, which he should also have answered only after *his* soup. The result was temporarily fatal to Scott, and justified the administration in assigning the command of the armies to General Taylor, who had, thus far, amply established his capacity for the trust.

But Taylor’s successes, brilliant as they were, were conclusive of nothing but the valour of our arms. They served rather to exasperate than to subdue the Mexican spirit. The national vanity, strange to say, found its excuse for the defeat of their armies, in the national dishonesty; and to charge its generals and leaders with treachery, was the excuse to others, and the salvo to its own self-esteem, of the national mind. The administration of Mr. Polk felt its error, as it perceived that Taylor’s victories brought the Mexicans no nearer to a readiness for negotiations. Peace was now highly desirable to the administration; the Northern States demanded it, and the democratic party, in that quarter, felt hourly its loss of ground. For once, in the history of thirty-five years—with the exception of the Florida war—the expenditure of national monies was diverted from the North to the South; and this unnatural direction given to the government patronage, grievously outraged the purse, and, consequently, the patriotism, of New-England. But Mr. Polk had got the wolf by the

ears. To let go his hold was quite as dangerous as to hold on. It became necessary to prosecute the war with vigour; and, for the first time, a reasonable plan of campaign was conceived. What had already taken place had been quite as much the result of impulse as design. Volunteers were called for from the most contiguous States, Southern and Western wholly, and Taylor was ordered to advance upon Monterey; while Wool was directed to march for Chihuahua, Kearney to make a descent upon Santa Fé, and finally, upon California. The administration seems to have exerted its best abilities in providing adequately the *personnel and materiel* for these several demonstrations. Taylor complained of neglect, and of a deficiency of requisite supplies and *materiel*; but the neglect seems to have been chiefly his own. He does not seem to have been possessed of an administrative mind. He wanted comprehensiveness of vision. Equal to the absolute emergencies of active war, to the close and ardent encounter, his genius yet lacked the forecast which is required to anticipate equally the events of war, and the necessities which they require. Of the blunders of Gen. Gaines, by which the government was greatly embarrassed, we do not desire to say anything. We prefer to respect the maxim, *de mortuis nil nisi bonum*. He was another of those time-worn warriors, who had survived their active uses, and to whom the government of a post or fortress might safely be confided, rather than an army, or a district of debatable territory.

Taylor's conquest of Monterey followed. We have given a history of this gallant achievement in previous pages. The armistice which the American general granted to the Mexicans was an error, and one quite as much to be ascribed to the age of the invading general, as to any good reasons of policy to be assigned for the measure. Those which have been assigned for the armistice are singularly inconclusive.

We have, at this period, a striking proof of the somewhat tortuous policy which Mr. Polk's administration was disposed to pursue, in suffering Santa Anna to return to Mexico, under passport. The reasons alledged for this strange indulgence, which allowed the Mexicans to recover the use of the ablest of their generals, at the most perilous moment of the war—the most popular of their chiefs—and, certainly, the most shrewd and cunning of

their politicians, are specious enough, but not satisfactory. The motive was, that he might overthrow Paredes, who was bitterly hostile to the United States, and anxious to convert the republic of Mexico into a monarchy, with an European prince upon the throne—an event which, it was feared, would bring about an alliance with Mexico and some European power, and thus afford support to the favourite idea of Guizot, of establishing, on this continent, a makeweight, in favour of European government, at the expense of the republican spirit everywhere active in America. Santa Anna was to be restored to Mexico, to defeat this scheme, and produce a new schism among parties. There is no proof of the fact, as asserted by the author of this book, that Santa Anna was favourable to peace, and had given assurances to this effect. The extract quoted by our author, to support this assertion, from the letter of Taylor, says only that Ampudia *had told him so*. The conclusion is illogical enough. The whole reasoning, in regard to the hopes built on Santa Anna's return, is not less so. As for any considerable party in Mexico being in favour of an European sovereign, nothing could be more absurd. It was a vagary of Paredes, when staggering under his bottle. It was his speculative philosophy, accompanying his soup, never held before dinner, and not to be carried into execution after it. The Mexicans, who had been, for twenty years, taught one long, unvarying, bitter lesson, of hate and hostility to royalty, were not to be revolutionized, in such a behalf, by a half-witted soldier, in momentary possession of a government which was perpetually changing its heads. M. Guizot's doctrine, of the balance of power extended to the American continent, was just as little likely to prevail with the Mexicans as with ourselves; nay, far less likely, since their communion with Europe is far less direct and intimate than our own—there is no such annual fusion of European settlers with their people, and their jealousy of royalty is heightened by a course of instruction, which has rung the changes incessantly upon the one prejudice which most appeals to the vanity of the nation.

The notion, that Santa Anna was to produce anarchy, confusion and civil war, by his re-appearance in Mexico, was equally ill-founded. On the contrary, it might have been reasonably anticipated that his presence would be to unite all parties. The unvarying successes of the



American armies, the utter defeat of their own, the rapid progress of Taylor—all had contributed to make easy the overthrow of Paredes—to make the nation turn their eyes upon one who had certainly, more than any of their living chieftains, identified himself with its triumphs and its pride. No one of their leaders, as we well knew, could inspire so much confidence in a time of danger; and none was better able, by his energy and real abilities, to concentrate the strength and develop successfully in defence the resources of the country. But, says the administration, we had reasons for assuming that Santa Anna would favour peace. What reasons? The assurance of Ampudia to Taylor, at Monterey, to this effect, demands no consideration, and, we are of opinion, did not influence the conduct of the administration in any degree. If he himself gave any distinct promise to this effect, it is not in the record, and it is due to the administration to produce it if they can. But Santa Anna dared not have given such assurance. His hope of power was founded upon the support of the war party; and the intense pride and and vanity of the nation, excusing its defects by charging treachery and incompetence upon its generals, was aroused rather than depressed, and made keen with the desire to find redress and revenge, under the guidance of a more competent chieftain. The overthrow of Paredes proved easy, and just as easy was the ascent of Santa Anna to the supreme authority. A new vigor was infused into the councils of the country upon his return, and resources, which surprised themselves, sprang rapidly up among the Mexicans, under the magic will of their Dictator.

The capture of Santa Fé by Kearney, the march of Wool upon Moncloava, the famous march of Doniphan upon Chihuahua, and the operations of Fremont and Stockton in California, imposing and even splendid achievements in themselves, had little or no effect upon the great issue. They have each had, and each deserves, its separate history. Their leaders crowned themselves with honour, and greatly added to the reputation of the American arms; but, with the exception of the progress of Fremont in California, which, by the way, was wholly a volunteer movement, the several expeditions might have been spared, and were gross excrescences upon the plan of warfare, producing none of the anticipated fruits, and showing an

equal ignorance of the *morale* of the Mexicans, and of the *modus operandi* in the work of conquest. The reorganization of the plan of war, the money and material consumed in Wool's progress to Monclova, that of Price and Doniphan, and even of Kearney's, via Santa Fé, to California, would have enabled Scott and Taylor to have penetrated to the city of Mexico, and to have obtained—what was next to it in importance—the possession of all the mining districts, in half the space of time. We need make no comments upon the suggested policy of a defensive line. Our purpose was either hostile or not. If the former, a defensive line was an absurdity; if not hostile, our troops should never have crossed the Rio Grande. The war, once begun, there is no question about the necessity of making your blows tell upon the enemy. You cannot take a defensive line in the territory of another nation, yet hope that they will be quiescent; and, if not quiescent, what motive can you possibly have for forbearance? The suggestion is not to be entertained for a moment. Half measures would have been equally fatal to the cause and the administration.

Fifty thousand volunteers having been called for, the question occurs as to the judgment of the administration in the selection of their generals. On this subject, there is no doubt that the President must have been somewhat influenced by section. The rule was a proper one which aimed to give a fair representation to the several sections from which the troops were drawn. Nor, generally speaking, as the results have shown, were the selections badly made. Major General Butler carried with him into the field, a reputation well won in the service, under the lead of Andrew Jackson; but we are very doubtful of the propriety of appointing old soldiers to active service in an enemy's country. Their *prestige* should be rather used in posts at home, and in preparing young beginners to follow in their footsteps. Butler led with habitual gallantry at Monterey, and the error which converted a diversion into a real and murderous assault—which was quite unnecessary,—the place being commanded by batteries already in our possession,—is not, we believe, to be charged to his account. Patterson's claims were, perhaps, rather political than military. Lane, Smith, Quitman and Shields, as Brigadiers, gave sufficient subsequent proof of the propriety of their appointment; the latter, if not as a good

general, as a good fighter at least, to whom even the perforation of the lungs by a grape shot is quite an unimportant circumstance. There is no doubt that, as Generals of Brigade, the three first of these gentlemen possessed really brilliant abilities. Of Shields, the generalship is very questionable; but no body can doubt his eager and headlong courage in situations the most desperate. Pierce and Cadwallader were clever captains enough. Of Hamer, but little has been heard; while, we are inclined to think that Pillow, a man of undoubted ability and courage, has been the victim of a very great injustice in the opinions of the public. Of all these, something may be said hereafter. In the mean time, the mood and temper of the administration with regard to General Scott, and of Scott, with regard to himself as well as the administration, have been undergoing a change. The great successes of Taylor have resulted in raising up a formidable rival of both. Scott has seen his error, in the loss of golden opportunities for fame. The administration, which we believe to have been really cold to the claims of Scott at first, and very glad to avail itself of his miserable reluctance to leave Washington,—being, in fact, no ways desirous to put him into a situation which would probably only increase his political capital as a claimant for the next Presidency—the administration,—now that Taylor, from an obscure brigadier by brevet, has grown to be the observed of all observers—the last edition of the successful warrior, and already announced as a people's candidate for the highest office in their gift—the administration is now not only willing, but anxious that Scott should assume the command in Mexico, and, by subsequent successes, obliterate the vivid impression of the deeds of Taylor. Scott, anxious to retrieve his error, of which he is now fully conscious, lends himself gladly to the scheme, as being absolutely essential for the purpose once more of putting himself in position. Nothing but the prompt use of brilliant opportunities in Mexico can possibly restore him to the high station which he held before in the eyes of the people. That hasty plate of soup!—that 'fire in front and rear'—which occasioned his petty squabbles with that sly, hard-favoured and relentless veteran politician, Marcy, have done much towards the discredit of a brilliant reputation; and the lost ground can only be recovered by the happiest uses of a friendly fortune. Scott sees the straits



of the administration—sees that all the capital to be acquired from the war in Mexico, is enuring, not to the democratic but to the whig party, and he neither the representative nor the recipient of it. He takes advantage of the predicament of the powers that be, and insists upon means, men and material, the most abundant. He has, in fact, *carte blanche*; he did not stint himself. In one respect, we are constrained to think that he abused the powers accorded him. He withdrew from Taylor all his regular troops—the most tried men in the service—reducing him to stand on the defensive merely, and lessening greatly his capacity even for the defensive. We must do General Scott the justice to say that he performed the painful operation with as much sweetness of temper and courtesy of language as could possibly consist with the performance. He was as soothing as the tooth-drawer about to operate upon your jaws—as courteous and conciliatory as the executioner when he approaches to adjust and tighten the cravat which a State provides for the victim whose last hours she attends ceremoniously, with many officers, amidst a large assemblage. Taylor could not complain of Scott's civility; but his reproach was to his magnanimity. Scott need have drawn none of Taylor's troops away. There was no reason why he should not have made up his army for the centre, without taking a single company from that of the north. He had *carte blanche*,—he had any number of volunteers,—and new regular regiments were to be raised and raising. It is said that Taylor was allowed a discretion in the matter, and might have withheld the troops. But this is not the truth. The letter of the Secretary of War, while affecting to give him the discretion, in fact allows him none. It tells him that if in “the withdrawal from your immediate command of the force necessary for this purpose, the army with you *may be placed in danger*,—this expedition (to Vera Cruz) must for the present be either deferred or abandoned—a result deeply to be regretted.” Now, we contend, that this language leaves to the honest old soldier no discretion. It throws upon him the responsibility,—which the government had no right to do,—of defeating the expedition to Vera Cruz. But it was not true that this expedition depended upon these troops. Thrice the number might have been raised for the purpose, and the same successful results would have ensued therefrom. It needed but a small regular force to

train the volunteers, so as to enable them to meet the requisitions of the service. No doubt, veterans would be more efficient; but the degree of efficiency is not the question. The question is in regard to the absolute necessity. Besides, to hint an appeal to the fears of a veteran general—to tell him to withhold the troops, only in the event of his apprehending danger—is, of all other modes, perhaps, the very best for obtaining the required object. But even this does not exhaust the objections to this proceeding. It is not merely that you leave with Taylor, a force barely sufficient for maintaining himself, but you cut him off from all performance. In the midst of a most brilliant and entirely successful military career, you suddenly arrest him, with a decree that he shall achieve no more—that he shall simply rest in the places won, and behold a rival captain, who has hitherto shown no desire to take the field, taking up the march of conquest, where he had been arrested, and hurrying on to the completion of the triumphs which he had so well begun. The blow was quite as painful to Taylor's military pride, as if you had actually sacrificed his army to the enemy. And such had been nearly the effect. The withdrawal of all the regular troops, by Scott, at once suggested to Santa Anna the prospect of a successful blow, to be struck at the feeble volunteer army left with Taylor, not numbering five thousand men; and, but for his own good conduct, the excellence of his officers, the judicious position which had been taken, and the wonderful valour of our brave fellows, of the South and West, the overwhelming legions of Santa Anna must have annihilated him. This victory at Buena Vista completed the circle of Taylor's successes. The people of the United States, by an infallible instinct, felt the wrong that had been done to him by the withdrawal of all his regulars; and when, in spite of his deficiencies, the tidings were brought of the wonderful victory which had followed to his arms, the empire of his spell was complete over the American heart. Scott's victories came too late to undo the charm. Now, we do not say, or insinuate, that, in withdrawing the regular troops from Taylor, it was designed to expose him to disaster, as was absolutely alledged in Congress; but we do say, that it might have been reasonably conjectured that such would be the fruits of such withdrawal; and not to anticipate the attempt of Santa Anna—availing

himself of a well known military principle—was to argue a degree of obtuseness in Mr. Secretary Marcy, as in Gen. Scott, which is sufficient to justify almost any sort of suspicion. Taylor complained, as well he might; and evidently felt that the troops were not so necessary to Scott, or to his successes, as it was necessary to the administration and Scott both, that he, Taylor, should achieve no more victories.

In the discussion of this portion of his subject, Mr. Chase is reduced to the necessity of a laborious special pleading, which it would require no special labour completely to overthrow. All the points made in the defence of the administration involve fatal errors of misstatement, and are argued illogically. It does not at all affect the question, to show that Taylor had no fears of Santa Anna, or that, with an equal confidence in himself and men, he felt sure that he could maintain himself in a defensive position. We object that he should have been reduced to this attitude merely. It was not one which his great services deserved. And still more do we object that the question should be discussed so nicely as to ascertain exactly the number of men necessary to keep him from being utterly crushed by his enemy. Something is said of Taylor's ignorance of the approach of Santa Anna; and the question is asked, with more pertness than pertinence, if Taylor could not conjecture his approach, he being on the spot, how could he require that Mr. Polk or Secretary Marcy should conjecture it? The answer is, that good generalship requires not merely a reliance upon the reports of spies, for these may be cut off, may be faithless, or may be prevented by the vigilance of the enemy—as was the case in this very instance—from obtaining necessary information; but we are to judge in respect to an enemy, by a due regard to what it is his policy to do and to attempt; and, with a soldier of Santa Anna's abilities and experience, the obvious policy was to strike, with overwhelming numbers, and suddenly, at a force so greatly reduced as that of Taylor, and stripped entirely of that portion of the army which had been trained by practice, and which had long before seen the smokes of an enemy. The argument is, that, by thus withdrawing the regular forces from Taylor, you at once invite the assault of the Mexican general; and though you might not have desired to afford him this



provocation, yet you might have foreseen that he would have taken advantage of it. But we must linger no longer on this subject.

Employed to prosecute the more vigorous assault meditated upon the heart of Mexico, General Scott was yet in possession of none of the confidence of the administration, except in his purely military capacity. There were several reasons why this confidence should be withheld. It was a matter of course, inevitable from the extremes occupied by the two national parties, and their nearly equal division of strength, that the administration employed with reluctance, and only as a matter of necessity, the services of one whose very successes must tell against the party by which it came into power. It is idle to talk of the magnanimity of party. This virtue was unknown, equally, to both of those by which the country was divided. They were both led by persons who were mostly seekers after spoils. The administration employed Scott because it could not well do otherwise, and only employed him when it was necessary to let down Taylor's popularity. But, as we have said, it did not trust Scott, though it employed him. The moment that his successes began, a commissioner was made to follow at his heels, with authority to make the treaty of peace, which, it was assumed that the successes of Scott's army would compel. Scott had scarcely made his headquarters at Jalapa, after the battle of Cerro Gordo, when Mr. N. P. Trist made his appearance. Our author admits that this was a most unhappy appointment, and wonders at Mr. Buchanan for having made it. It is something of a commentary upon the magnanimity of party and party chiefs, when we find our author, himself a partizan, hinting that "the Secretary was anxious to appropriate all the eclat resulting from the conclusion of peace to the State department,"—and hence his employment of an obscure clerk of that department. In truth, this was the miserable struggle with all the parties,—the general, the administration, the secretary, and last, not least, the secretary's clerk, Mr. Trist; who, no doubt, anticipated large political capital for himself, in taking the responsibility, finally, of doing what he was absolutely forbidden to do. The appointment of the commissioner, that he might take the game out of the hands of the generalissimo, substituting the olive for the sword at the auspicious

moment, would, of itself, no matter who were the person, have been a wrong, under any circumstances, to a successful commanding general; unless, as in the present instance, where the commanding general, however brave and skilful in the field, had shown himself weak, unsteady and unwise in all other respects. As a politician or statesman, Scott had no rank, and his recent exhibition, in the former character, had been of a sort even to disparage his genuine merits, as a man of high military genius. They certainly destroyed all the political prospects which had been based upon his achievements in the field. The administration was not disposed to rely upon Mr. Trist; and we may remark it as somewhat curious, that our author says nothing of the effort of the administration to create the superior grade of lieutenant-general in the American army. This was only another means of defeating the chances of Scott, and lessening his claims to the exclusive conduct of the war. Its result would have been to throw into other hands the final adjustment of the terms of peace. Even if we allow the propriety of such a grade of office, the moment taken for its creation was singularly ill-chosen. It alarmed still farther the friends of General Scott, whom the appointment of another, and a civilian, to the superior office, would have greatly outraged. The pretext for the appointment was not satisfactory, since there was no real danger of discrepant action between the major generals in the field; and, if the office was to be created, there was no obvious reason why Scott should not have received it. The creation of the office, and the appointment of Benton to it, would have indicated nothing less than his nomination to the democratic party as the successor to the throne. In any point of view, it was a false move, which inevitably must compel hostility in both parties. What an opportunity was lost, on this occasion, by Mr. Polk, for establishing his popularity beyond assault. Had he—when they were cavilling in Congress against his lieutenant general—taken command of the army himself, and suddenly appeared at the head of the forces at Vera Cruz, what an effect would have been produced, not merely in our own country, but in Europe! Such would have been the course of Andrew Jackson, had he found himself in the same circumstances; and such a course would probably have secured for Polk the

the re-nomination to the presidency, with every prospect of success. Scott and Trist soon quarrelled. They were both vain persons; but Scott had strength and genius, and a long career of noble services must be suffered to excuse his weakness. Mr. Trist's vanity was that of a forward clerk, suddenly puffed into importance by promotion beyond his deserts. The correspondence between Scott and himself is creditable to neither. The administration seems to have erred in allowing Trist to be the first to communicate to Scott his appointment as commissioner; but, his victories achieved, it would not have been greatly regretted could he have been disgusted to such a degree as to provoke his resignation. We are not prepared to say that the affair became any more creditable, when, from being deadly antagonists, Scott and Trist suddenly became friends, and slept under the same blanket—in other words, in the same tent. The change was remarkable, and may be ascribed to the feeling of a common necessity between them. The government very soon repudiated Mr. Trist, and recalled him; but Scott, by this time, had resumed all his asperity in his correspondence with the government, and, under his sanction, Mr. Trist continued the negotiations, from which he had been especially commanded to withdraw. Scott's course, in other respects, had not given satisfaction to the administration. He was accused of sleeping upon his victories, instead of following them up; being anxious to obtain a peace, which he knew was required in the country, and thus foregoing many of the advantages which might have resulted from a vigorous prosecution of the war. His very solicitude for peace is supposed to have stimulated the perseverance of the enemy. He too fondly calculated upon it, as the fruit of each of his successes. We are not satisfied that Gen. Scott acted wisely in dismissing seven of the volunteer regiments, whose time of service had nearly expired, soon after he had won the fight of Cerro Gordo. His reasoning does not seem quite satisfactory. Had he promptly used the interval between the period of the capture of Jalapa, and that of the expiration of their term of service, he might have pushed on to Mexico. Once there, and "revelling in the halls of Montezuma," their temporary suffering from *nostalgia* might have been materially alleviated; and they would have been content to await the return of the ensuing winter, for



the transit through Vera Cruz, on their return. It is objected, that Scott did injustice to the patriotism of these troops, in assuming that they would not have been reconciled by success to a prolongation of their term of service. The result was, that he was compelled, after the dismissal of these troops, to remain inactive, in waiting for the arrival of the ten regiments of regulars which had been authorized by Congress.

Of the farther progress of the war, it is not our purpose to speak. The generalship of Scott is not now under discussion, We must leave this to future pages. It is enough, we venture the opinion, that, so far as he is concerned, the administration is obnoxious to no just reproaches, from the day of his arrival in Mexico. It seems to have seconded, in good faith, all his reasonable designs and objects. His recall was fully justified by the miserable snarl into which he suffered himself to fall with his generals. The treaty concluded with Mr. Trist—acting as a self-constituted commissioner—was one of which the administration, though disapproving of the presumption which made him act in defiance of its express commands, might reasonably take advantage. He knew what was demanded, or expected, by the country, and the terms of peace were not unreasonable, under the circumstances of the war. The Mexicans yielded to the United States a territory, which they had shown themselves as incapable to *use* as to keep, and received in return certain millions of money, which were needed for the maintenance of the peace which had been accorded them. We acquired an empire, which, in the hands of our people, must develope resources for the general benefit of the human race, not less than our own, such as the mind can scarcely measure; but which, in the hands of the Mexicans, must still have remained locked up in a savage sterility, unavailable to civilization. The treaty of Trist, unauthorized as he was to execute one, was judiciously adopted by the administration, and was honourable to its diplomacy. Nor was its general policy, in the progress of the war, less so. In spite of the faults committed—and they were many—the civil management of affairs was quite as creditable as the military. The departments worked with energy, zeal and good capacity. The national credit remained unimpaired—our trade was unbroken—our commerce swam safely in every sea, and,

while we had fifty thousand troops in the field, day by day engaged in bloody conflict, in a foreign territory, the pressure of the war was totally unfelt among our people.

Not less substantial, if less brilliant, were the labours of the Polk administration in the civil affairs of the country. Pledged, by the terms of his nomination, to a strictly revenue tariff, Mr. Polk prosecuted this object in good faith, and with proper energy. He was admirably supported in his purposes, by the efficient aid and sagacious industry of his Secretary, Mr. Walker. This gentleman brought to his task, a clear head, a very extensive knowledge of financial and commercial affairs, and an acute discernment of faculty, that left him few equals in the argument. But, it is very doubtful if the success of his plans would have crowned the administration with one of its most wholesome triumphs, had it not been for the concurrence of very favouring circumstances. The want of food in Europe affording a market for American breadstuffs in that quarter, proved an invincible argument to the grain-growing regions of the West, without which it might not have been so easy to persuade them of the benefits destined to flow from their recognition of the free trade philosophy. The progress of events, which the South-Carolina politicians, almost alone, had been predicting and urging for twenty years, enabled the democratic party to effect a result, in respect to our tariff policy, which otherwise could not have made head against the cupidity of parties. It will require still a longer time to enable the mind of the country to appreciate the inflexible courage of South-Carolina, in regard to this much vexed question. The protective system, in fact, was doomed to utter overthrow, in 1832, by the course taken by South-Carolina. Mr. Clay saved it for a season, and the compromise act was not simply the temporary defeat of the free trade politicians—it was the saving act of mercy for the manufacturers. Verily, they owe this statesman much. But neither Mr. Clay, nor his then ally, Mr. Webster, nor the manufacturers, were to be bound by any terms of faith, the moment the opportunity occurred for evasion. The odious tariff act of 1842 violated all the guaranties of the compromise act, nine years before. It was full of those delightful discriminations which went to sacrifice the trade, production and commerce of the country, to the grasping avarice of a single

interest. In the speech of Mr. Clay, at the time of the passage of the compromise act, in 1833, he professed himself anxious to bring down the rate of duties to the revenue standard. He professed to be desirous only to let the manufacturers down easily. It was necessary, *pro tempore*, to feed them rather highly; but he promised that, at no distant day, they would be able to feed themselves, and, with simple revenue duties only, to enjoy a protection quite sufficient to compete with the foreign manufacturer. This had been the cry for thirty years; each session of Congress, however, hearing from those cornorants after protection, the clamour for increase—"give, give," being the monotonous chaunt, like that of the daughter of the horse leech. In 1842, Mr. Webster congratulated his constituents, with the hope that the principles of the compromise act were repudiated for ever. Mr. Clay, too, previous to his nomination for the presidency, about the same time, in his speech at Raleigh, coolly gave the quietus to his former assurances, made in 1833. His phrase was the stereotyped one—a tariff for revenue, *and discriminations for protection*—a convenient phraseology, like the cloak of charity, which sufficed to cover any multitude of sins. Subsequently, and in due degree with his increasing sense of danger in the approaching canvas, he abandoned the compromise act wholly, and, by a letter to a Pennsylvania whig committee, gave in his adhesion to that of 1842. His scruples were not outraged by any unnecessary reference to his previous language, when he emphatically denounced the American statesman who, in either House of Congress, should venture to disturb the conditions of what he described as "a treaty of peace and amity."

It is in reference to this issue between himself and Mr. Clay, that Mr. Polk's short-comings have subjected him to just censures. The pledges demanded by the resolutions of the democratic convention were of a kind to admit of no paltering. The terms were not so equivocal as to afford any opportunity "to keep the word of promise to the ear, yet break it to the hope." Yet the letter of Mr. Polk, to Mr. Kane, was of this very order. He yielded to the common practice of trading politicians, and wrote such a letter as enabled his tariff supporters in Pennsylvania to insist that he was quite as friendly to the protectionists as Mr. Clay himself. He, too, was for a

revenue tariff, but with discriminations for protection; and when he said, "I am opposed to a tariff protection *merely*, and not for revenue;" he was guilty, either of the most gross and mistaken use of language, or of a deliberate and artful evasion of the truth. The protectionists might reasonably swear for him and by him. The idea of a tariff for protection, which discards the idea of revenue, is an impertinence. But we do not know that we are altogether free to censure him for thus stultifying Demos. The conventional morality among politicians insists upon the success of the party, and justifies the means, no matter of what sort, by which it is attained. Thus, Mr. Cass has two lives, one for the North and another for the South; and General Taylor, from being an honest and straight forward soldier, when fighting with the Mexicans, the moment that he breathes the atmosphere of civil parties, prates, with double tongue, in the ears of antagonist voters. But if Polk erred in the equivocal letter to Kane, his error did not survive his election. Indeed, it would then have had no uses. His first message, on this subject, showed him faithful to the published creed of his party. His Secretary, Walker, made a report on the head, which gave him celebrity abroad, as well as at home; the British House of Lords having ordered the publication of an edition of it for the use of their body. In June, 1846, the House of Representatives proceeded to the consideration of a bill for the repeal of the tariff of 1842. The principles laid down in this report are briefly summed up in the following resolutions:

"1st. That no more money should be collected than is necessary for the wants of the government, economically administered.

"2d. That no duty be imposed on any article above the lowest rate which will yield the largest amount of revenue.

"3d. That, below such rate, discrimination may be made, descending in the scale of duties; or, for imperative reasons, the article may be placed in the list of those free from all duty.

"4th. That the maximum revenue duty should be imposed on luxuries.

"5th. That all minimums, all specific duties, should be abolished, and ad valorem duties substituted in their place, care being taken to guard against fraudulent invoices and under-valuation, and to assess the duty upon the actual market value.

"6th. That the duties should be so imposed as to operate as equally as possible throughout the Union, discriminating neither



for nor against any class or section.”—*Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, December 3d, 1845.*

Of the debate, singularly able as it was, which ensued upon this struggle, our author gives an ample report, to which our readers will refer in his pages. He has done well to embody the leading arguments *pro and con*. They will be of use hereafter. His history gives us the leading events of Congress, at this juncture; the feeble and vexatious course of Mr. Senator Haywood, of North-Carolina, and the perverse proceedings of Mr. Jarnagin, of Tennessee, by whose refusal to vote the necessity was thrown upon the Vice President, Dallas, of giving the casting vote. Our author dwells, in language of grandiloquence, upon what he is pleased to style the moral firmness of this gentleman. This vote he describes as “an act of bold and majestic grandeur, which stamped him as one of the distinguished men of the age,” This is all fudge. Mr. Dallas is a very sensible and amiable gentleman, and his conduct was simply manly and honest—nothing more. No great moral firmness was necessary. It was his policy, no less than his duty, to do as he did. He had identified himself with a triumphant party, in the full flood of prosperity and power. His political hopes looked to this quarter only. The ill consequences of his vote with his party, are to be found in a measurable loss of popularity in his single state, from which he had no expectations. That he was true to his pledges, and manfully considerate of his position, is the sole credit due to his conduct on this occasion. He behaved like a gentleman and a christian, and that is all that need be said of the matter.

There is no necessity that we should dwell upon the conflicts, or repeat the arguments, in behalf of the modified tariff of 1846—a tariff that may yet be greatly improved, by farther modifications. But the reader who is curious may find a very fair statement of the whole in these pages of Mr. Chase. For the present, we omit all reference to minimum, specific and *ad valorem* duties, and the warehousing system. These subjects will keep, for discussion hereafter. The extract which follows is in curious illustration of the degree of foreign and domestic confidence which the Polk administration inspired.

“It is extraordinary, that the credit of the government, during

the war with Mexico, was remarkably high. This is the more surprising, from the fact that the bonds of the government, during the preceding administration, and in time of peace, were hawked about in the markets of Europe without success. A loan of twenty-three millions was authorized by the act of the 28th of January, 1847. Of that sum, five millions were paid to satisfy the claims of public creditors, or exchanged for specie, at par. Eighteen millions were offered for specie, to the highest bidder, and were awarded, at premiums varying from one-eighth of one per cent. to two per cent. above par. This was, indeed, not only a very extraordinary, but an unexpected result. At the time it occurred, there was no prospect of an immediate termination of the war with Mexico. On the 10th of April, 1847, when it was awarded to the highest bidders, Vera Cruz and the castle of San Juan d'Ulloa had surrendered to our victorious arms. But the enemy manifested an obstinate determination to resist the progress of the invaders, and, subsequently to that period, the road to Mexico was rendered memorable by many a sanguinary battle-field. Under these circumstances, that the money should have been obtained by the government at a premium, presented a novelty to the financial world."

There were several things done during this administration, of the propriety of which we have our doubts. We are scarcely prepared to approve of the mixed interests, public and private, which are involved in the terms upon which our mail steamers have been built. The public purse usually suffers from most partnerships with individuals, and these mail steamers would, most probably, and quite as soon, have gone into operation, by the natural force of commercial enterprize, without a dollar being appropriated by government. But we had the example of Great Britain to urge. Great Britain is a monarchy, which exhibits few such instances of the profligate waste of public money as occur in the progress of a republic; but, even in Great Britain, we are now told, that these mail steamers are found to be quite unsuitable to war purposes, to which, in the event of a necessity, they were to be diverted. We are farther told, that the American steamers are still less susceptible of such use than the British. Yet, this was the plausible pretext, in the encouragement given to these *quasi* men-of-war. And it is now gravely proposed to give us a fleet of these mail steamers, with the benevolent purpose of carrying free negroes to Africa; as if the United States government had any right to engage in the colonization of other regions.

We should be doing injustice to Mr. Polk, were we to omit a reference to his manly and judicious use of the veto power. He vetoed sundry bills, making wild appropriations for internal improvements—words which, considering the monstrous and criminal waste of public money which their use implied, might very properly be written infernal improvements—the fruits of a very satanic selfishness. These vetoes furnished the occasion for great uproar among the opposition, who were for abolishing this power wholly, or so abridging it, in the hands of the President, as to render it valueless. The veto power is one of the most valuable, as it is one of the most conservative, of which the executive stands possessed. It is scarcely possible to conceive an instance in which its exercise can be mischievous. Its worst evils can only be in a temporary delay in legislation. It may retard legislation, but cannot defeat it in the end. Its importance is in the prevention of wild, crude, and precipitate legislation, which is one of the great dangers of a people so impulsive as ours. It affords time for reflection to the national mind, and, except in war, we know but little legislation that is not greatly helped by a little reasonable delay. The great outcry, on this subject, by the whigs, was significant of very little wool. When we come to look at the burden and occasions for complaint, we find them sink into the most miserable insignificance. Mr. Chase tells us that the veto power has been exercised on *twenty-four* occasions only, since the organization of the government under the present constitution, and, in the mean time, seven thousand seven hundred laws have been passed. We accord to Mr. Polk the credit of doing well, on all the occasions when it was used by him. He used it but *three* times, Tyler *four*, Jackson *nine*, Monroe on *one* occasion only, Madison *six* times, and Washington *twice*. We should have been better satisfied with Mr. Polk, had he even used it more frequently. The reasons which he has assigned for yielding his approval to the bill for giving a territorial government to Oregon, are far from satisfactory. That bill, with the Wilmot Proviso grafted upon it, was an indignity, if not an injury to the South, which a Southern President might well have resented.

During the administration of Mr. Polk, two territories (Iowa and Wisconsin) were admitted into the Union, and the territories of Oregon, California, Utah and New Mexi-

co acquired, but not organized. The strifes which these were to entail upon us were, fortunately for himself, consigned to his successor. The county and town of Alexandria were retroceded to Virginia. Much else was done, not necessary for us to notice, but belonging to his term of office. It may be said of this administration, representing a great national party, that it achieved too much. It attained too many of its objects. It left the party but little capital. Free trade secured, the Bank of the United States an obsolescence, and the doctrine of internal improvements being nearly equally shared with the two parties, the uses of both of them were pretty much at an end; and this contributed greatly to the success of General Taylor. But this is a topic which belongs to future pages. Mr. Polk retired from the helm of State, literally to die. He barely survived to reach his retirement in Tennessee. He died of diarrhœa and exhaustion, peacefully, with a manly calmness and resignation, and after reconciliation with the christian church whose tenets he professed. His career was eventful and honourable to his memory; but his successes were due rather to the inevitable progress of events, and to convictions in the public mind, which, under successive statesmen, had been slowly maturing, for a period of nearly thirty years, than to the vigour or the originality of his own mind. He was the proper representative of party; not independent of its will—pliant in policy, and by no means tenacious of his own particular suggestions. Using the word in a sense not too strict, Mr. Polk was a good man—a person of amiable nature and generous tendencies. We doubt his firmness—his will—his independent resolution, the moment we find him in a situation where his party becomes divided, or where its resolutions are unknown. His weakness at such moments was illustrated admirably in the adjustment of the Oregon difficulties, and in his final surrender of the case to the hands of the Senate.

A few words more in respect to Mr. Chase,—one whom, by the way, we have treated with very fair courtesy, and whose book, we may safely say in this place, is a very readable and instructive one, in spite of sundry instances of bad taste, and a too frequent exhibition of congressional eloquence—a sort of hyperbole, which is beyond definition. Mr. Chase, like most of the politicians of our time, is too thoroughly a party man for our purposes.



Party, with him, is evidently patriotism. It is his breath of life. His standards never rise beyond its exactions, and he evidently regards this condition of mind as a sort of virtue. We have a very clear, and, we think, just estimate, of the uses of party. But, just now, it has its dangers. We could give frequent instances, from this volume, where it is quite evident that Mr. Chase's judgment is rendered imperfect by his subserviency to party. We are afraid he belongs to that class which would quarrel with any patriotism that runs counter to the temporary regulations of party. He clearly does not so much regard the country as the party. He plainly regards the Union as a something to be held sacred, apart from the constitution. This, we may regard as an unhappy superstition. When Mr. Chase threatens with the halter all those who think that party wrongs may justify patriotism in taking ground against the Union, even when the latter is used for the purposes of wrong-doing and usurpation—he ceases to be a respected authority in our sanhedrim. Take a paragraph, which will show his idea of settling the accounts of those who quarrel with his superstition :

“The people understand fully the object of a few disorganizers at the North and South. They appreciate, to the full value, and no more, the threats at encroachment or dissolution which are so freely used. They can listen to this with some patience, but let threats be followed by a single *overt act*, and they will hang the traitors as high as Haman was hung.”

This is emphatic enough. But what shall be done with those who violate the constitution, by which, alone, the Union has its existence? Mr. Chase makes no disposition of these excellent people. In other countries, where patriotism resists government, even to rebellion, as in Germany, Italy, Hungary, our Northern brethren are the first to applaud. They expend upon these foreign rebels, few of whom really deserve it, a world of sympathy and encouragement. But when it is a usurpation over the South, fatal to Southern pride, character, independence, property and safety, the case changes. Then it is the patriots who resist that are to be hung, and the tyranny to be maintained. A word in Mr. Chase's ear, and, through him, to all other politicians of the same school. You will not cure the evil, brother, by such threats as these. Nay, you will only precipitate the event. The

South must have justice, must have security and independence; and will have it, be sure of this, at every hazard, as soon as her people become fully aware of the extent and dangers of the usurpation. When you speak thus you are guilty of quite as much ignorance as stupidity. There is no man in the South who goes for disunion *per se*. The South has always loved the Union, with a passion little short of idolatry. She has paid, and is paying dearly, for her attachment. If you would save the Union, you must do justice to the South. You must not kick the South. The South likes neither robbery nor kicking. The union with brethren is grateful to the South—the alliance with loving sister States very precious. But when, for the old fathers of the constitution, you give us such substitutes as Hale and Seward, we see that the Union is a very different affair from that which Washington fought for, and Jefferson and Madison administered. Hale and Seward, indeed, and Benton and Houston and Gerrit Smith, et id omne genus. Apes and monkeys, Mr. Chase! apes and monkeys!

---

ART. II.—*Mental Hygiene; or an Examination of the Intellect and Passions.* Designed to show how they affect and are affected by the bodily functions, and their influence on health and longevity. By WILLIAM SWEETSER, M.D., Professor of the Theory and Practice of Medicine, in Bowdoin, Castleton and Geneva, Medical Colleges, and Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. New-York: 1850.

HYGIENE may be defined the philosophy of health, and an essay on the philosophy of mental health ought to interest all classes of readers. Nothing can be less philosophical, however, than the majority of treatises accumulated upon the subject of hygiene. They are either empirical, on the one hand, consisting of a series of truisms, and of “wise saws and modern instances;” or, on the other, dogmatical and authoritative, presenting a code of rules and ordinances—the purpose being to attract atten-

tion and attain notoriety, by the assertion of some novel and peculiar opinions.

The volume before us belongs to the former class. The writer brings together, in an easy and pleasant style, and with some prolixity of detail, a great mass of observations, scattered throughout a number of familiar works. We are not aware that he has announced any thing new or startling. He tells us that ennui, or want of mental occupation, is a source of oppressive suffering to the retired rich ; that precocity is a condition dangerous to those afflicted with it ; that overwork of the mind must be carefully shunned ; that all indulgence of the passions in excess tends to evil ; that anger makes pale, and flushes, and excites vehemently ; that fear depresses and relaxes, and turns the hair suddenly gray ; that grief and joy, both, threaten life and sanity, and that it is difficult to say which of them most frequently fulfils the threat ; that mountaineers, and especially the Swiss, are addicted to homesickness ; that suicide is a terrible result of a great variety of causes, many of them apparently inadequate ; in fine, that the diseases of the body affect the mind, and that mental action and passion in turn affect the body ; and that it behoves physicians to pay due attention, always, to the principle of mutual relation and connection which binds them thus closely together.

To illustrate these doctrines, he offers us a very readable compilation of stories, from numerous authorities. He gives himself no trouble to inquire into modes of affection and influence ; he enters upon no examination of the primary origin of agencies, or the seats on which their effects are exerted. The tendencies of his popular and superficial essay are, however, unobjectionable ; the advocates of temperance and prudence must be ever in the right. We excuse in him a little undue readiness to believe, a little propensity to embellishment or colouring, perhaps a little exaggeration. The evil he strikes at is so obviously evil ; the good he proposes is so evidently desirable, that he carries with him our sympathy, even when he wearies us with commonplaces.

But the day has arrived, surely, when selection is required from the load of empirical observations that have obtained currency by mere repetition ; when investigation is demanded into the truth of received opinions, their foundation, the inferences to be drawn from them, and

the results to which they lead. We cannot but lament that English writers have so generally shunned these discussions, fearful, we presume, that anything minute or profound would hardly obtain a perusal. Combe, Abercrombie and Holland, in Great Britain, and Brigham, in this country, have, it is true, presented us with some valuable thoughts—scattered and desultory, however—on the topics enumerated on the title page of Dr. Sweetser's book, rather than treated of in its body.

They have received somewhat more attention on the continent, and we are in possession of much useful material, contributed by Gall and Spurzheim, Albert and Broussais; but by far the best and most philosophical work in this department is the "Medical Psychology" of Feuchtersleben, recently translated for the Sydenham Society, by Lloyd, and edited by the distinguished Dr. Ba-  
bington, of London.

Availing ourselves freely of the labours of these writers, and of all others who have presented any notices adapted to our purpose, we shall proceed to offer some remarks and comments upon the statements and views sketched or spread forth in the well got up duodecimo before us.

It is not settled, as yet, what health is, or whether we are to regard it as a positive or negative condition; whether it must be acquired, or only protected and preserved. Upon the answer to these questions must depend our doctrines of hygiene. Commencing our task with the physical education of the infant, we shall, if we adopt the latter view, abstain from interfering farther than to avoid carefully those things which may injure or pervert; if the former, we shall feel it our duty actively to set about obtaining what is defective and restoring what has been lost. We shall, perhaps, on reflection, conclude that there can be no abstract rule laid down for our government here, and that each case must be individualized and considered in its relation to surrounding contingencies.

We must inquire, also, what is the purport of the word "mental," as applied to hygiene, and why we speak of psychology in separate phrase. The mind—the "psychical principle"—can we ever regard it as diseased, in any exclusive sense? Have we any idea of a sound mind but as connected with a sound body; or, vice versa, an unsound mind without manifestations of bodily disease? "Pain," a condition almost synonymous with "disease,"



is it not essentially a morbid perception? and is not perception a function simply mental?

“Matter and spirit,” says Feuchtersleben, “when they are united to form body and mind, can no longer be considered otherwise than as unity.” Mental hygiene, then, if the phrase be at all permissible, must be taken to denote a mere branch of the great general topic, in no manner or form capable of being treated separately or exclusively. All bodily changes affect the great *psychical principle* within us, in some mode, more or less; all mental actions or emotions affect the body, in some mode, more or less. It is impossible to say which acts on the other, in the first instance. We cannot tell whether the primary instinct shows itself by the *desire* of food, which, implanted, as a force necessary for self-preservation, in the sentient portion of the new-born animal, arouses the digestive apparatus, and so brings about the physical movements belonging to normal appetite; or whether the organic condition of the stomach itself excites *desire*, a mental state, followed by movements conducing to its gratification. We are ourselves inclined to the former suggestion. It seems unreasonable to imagine a creature born hungry; physical changes require more time for their production than mental acts. Capacities lie dormant; affinities rouse them. The odour, or touch of the mother’s breast, and its sweet, bland flow, awaken the animal susceptibility, and volition follows perception. The unit, to employ the language of our German, must be developed as a unit. Organs require to be brought into action by appropriate stimuli, which affect their sensibilities; they remain imperfect if not thus stirred or solicited. Thus it is that idiots of the lowest grade are not competent even to those functions most emphatically pronounced instinctive; they fail in the co-ordination of movements that must be associated to effect a purpose. We once saw a little creature, which, during the seven years of its miserable, but little more than vegetable life, had only uttered inarticulate, discordant and abrupt cries; always swallowed with painful and menacing difficulty, as if about to suffocate; had never made a motion for any apparent object; and whose limbs and trunk, whenever moved at all, were agitated irregularly and convulsively.

The brain, the great organ through which mind manifests itself, is subject to the universal physiological laws

of growth and conformation. Here, then, we must begin our study of "mental hygiene;" this is the threshold of "medical psychology." All the influences, so industriously traced out by modern philanthropists, as impressing malignantly the bodily health of the masses, exert their power here also. Want of air, light and proper food give rise to idiocy, in its several grades, as well as to scrofula and typhus. Toynbee tells us that deafness is frequently connected with early scrofula; this inlet of perception closed, the deaf-mute seldom reaches full mental development. All the world knows the coincidence of goitre with cretinism, a familiar form of idiocy; but goitre is, if not scrofula, closely allied in nature and contingencies of causation. When any portion of brain is absolutely absent, we have no resource, and if all idiocy were structural, the case would be desperate. But the contrary is now well known, not only from anatomical observation, but from the results of well-directed attempts to nourish, arouse, and, by proper stimuli, develop the dormant, and therefore imperfect organ. The name of Guggenbühl, harsh to our half Saxon ears, is euphonious to the very heart of humanity and of heaven, as that of the man who first had the boldness to conceive the possibility of educating Cretins, and the glory of success, by persevering personal labour. We have a very good essay on cretinism from the pen of a cultivated and educated cretin, Odet.

The general and uncomplicated idiocy so often met with every where, has since engaged the attention of many philanthropists, among whom we name Ferrus, in France, Twining, in England, and Howe, in our own country. May God's blessing rest on all such benevolent efforts! The plan of treatment illustrates the principle with which we set out. The patient is well fed, well lodged and clad. His senses are educated in all their susceptibilities. He is taught to imitate actions of all kinds; to co-ordinate all connected movements. Under this course all improve, more or less; all become more human; many advance considerably; a few reach the average standard. Wherever there is improvement, the head grows, gets larger and better shaped. This is as certain as that the limbs and trunk shall grow with the progress of animal or physical life.

The brain of every variety of the human species has

an average bulk and weight, which varies at different ages. Upon its proportion and symmetry depends the health of the whole organism, regarding man as an unit. It attains its fullest size about the 25th year, generally. There are exceptions both ways; in some it does not increase, it is said, after the 16th year. Dr. Spurzheim told a distinguished friend of ours, that, in one person, he had known it grow until the age of 35. Atrophy, or want of due nourishment of the cerebral mass, exhibits itself, not only by mental inertness, but also by bodily defect. The contrasted condition of hypertrophy, or undue-development, is one of the causes of precocity. This our author speaks of as it is generally considered, a dangerous condition; and such it is, if artificially induced, by stimulating the tender organ, or if accompanied by disproportion or want of symmetry. But natural precocity is often the result of a nicer and better organization, and is then consistent with the highest health and the greatest longevity. Many of the most eminent men that ever lived, and some of the oldest, have been remarkable for early mental and bodily activity.

Our doctrine of the unity of the human organism requires that abstinence from intellectual exertion shall be enjoined in all states of bodily debility and disorder. This is clear enough; but we must inquire what condition is most favourable to the action of the mind. Under what contingencies shall we think to most purpose? Habits being readily formed, it is incumbent on us to begin early the training of youth to think well, safely, and efficiently. "As thought impedes digestion," says our profound German, "so does digestion impede thought." Therefore we must not study upon a full stomach. Again, "the habit of sitting while in thought has at least as much share as the habit of thinking, itself, in the difficulty of breathing and abdominal plethora so frequent among students." But he goes on to warn us that "muscular action also impedes thought;" and his countryman, Kant, one of the most profound of thinkers, observes, that "intense thought fatigues much more in the act of walking than at other times." On the other hand, our learned American informs that "it was while walking in the fields and groves that Aristotle imparted his instructions, whence probably, came his disciples to be called Peripatetics," of which hard word he gives us the Greek derivation. The

disciples of Socrates deserve the same title, for, in defiance of the fatigue of hard thinking and walking together, *he* also, "Socrates, had no fixed place for his lectures, instructing his pupils sometimes in the groves of Academus, sometimes on the banks of the Ilyssus." On the whole, we may infer that excess is the true evil to be avoided—the true obstacle to successful study. A child must not be put or kept to his lessons when he is tired or sleepy, when just satiated with food, nor when hungry. Perhaps, for physical reasons, comprising total absence of voluntary motion, and fuller supply of blood to the brain, the recumbent posture is best fitted for close, continued, and severe thought. But we must not trouble the young with these niceties. Beyond what has just been said, neither time, place, nor any other circumstance should be allowed to interfere with the employment necessary to develop all the faculties of the perfect man.

We concur with our author in all that he enjoins as to forbearance from too urgent teaching, in early life. The venerable Dr. Warren, of Boston, has given the outlines of a good general rule, to which exceptions may be made, doubtless, but should be made with much caution. "Children under 14 should not be kept in school more than 6 or 7 hours a day, and this period should be shortened for females. It should be broken into many parts, so as to avoid a long confinement at one time." For farther detail, we would refer to a more recent American writer on hygiene, who says, "I would regulate the hours of study in a ratio to the age of the child; between three and five years, three hours daily, of school discipline, are enough; from five to ten, we may impose five hours of study and confinement, but no more; from ten to fourteen, six or seven hours may be spent in preparing and reciting lessons, and undergoing all instruction and practice, in whatever departments. We ought to remember that all is not usually completed in the school room; the lessons there laid out, to be got at home, absorb much additional time, and occasion much wearisome labour. This should be included in our estimate." We approve of these suggestions. Sir Thomas More, in his exquisitely imagined Utopia, does not permit more than seven hours of regular labour to be allotted to any one.

We fully agree, also, with Dr. Warren, in denying the propriety of "the application of *the system of rivalry*," as



he calls it, to the softer sex. Experience shows its unadaptedness to their more delicate organization. For the spirit of emulation, the wish to excel, he would substitute principles and motives of higher character, and better fitted to act upon these more pliant subjects—the sense of duty, the desire to be loved, the patient and kindly influence of the teacher. For our own part, if we admitted at all of the distribution of premiums among girls, it should be for gentleness, docility, goodness; but for no form of cleverness.

Among boys, there is no substitute for the great motive of the manly breast—ambition; but, lest it degenerate into or become mixed with jealousy or envy, we would not press it too strongly. Applying it with a certain degree of reserve, we would aid it with the most familiar impelling power of the ancient world, the *vis a tergo*, a favourite, doubtless, of the wise Solomon, the time-honoured rod, which it is too much the fashion in these modern days, and in this western hemisphere especially, to neglect.

In this relation, we would bring to the notice of teachers one particular topic, which has not been considered as it deserves. In fact, it is definitely treated of by but one writer, the sagacious Holland. This is—we use his language—“the variation in the mental faculty, of holding one image or thought continually before it, as the object of contemplation. The limit to this faculty, in all men, is certain and obvious, and, in most cases, narrower than is generally supposed. The persisting retention of the same idea manifestly exhausts the mind. But, nevertheless, the power, as to time, is very different in different individuals, is susceptible of cultivation, and, if cultivated with care in the discipline, becomes a source of some of the highest excellencies of an intellectual and moral nature. It stands contrasted with that desultory and powerless state of mind, which is unable to regulate its own workings, or to retain the thought fixedly on points most essential to the object of it.”

We are, indeed, too apt to regard thought as a quasi telegraphic, electrical, or luminous movement, totally independent of *the element of time*; but this demands to be distinctly recognized and allowed for. “There is, in fact,” says the author last quoted, in continuation, “a material variation in the time in which the same mental functions

are performed by different individuals, depending on different organization, or on causes of which we can give no account. This holds good, not only in acts purely mental, but also in those associated with material phenomena. The difference is yet more remarkable from comparison of states in the same person, and from that examination of consciousness which every one may make for himself. It will be felt that there are moments when the perceptions and thoughts are not only more vivid, but seem to pass more rapidly and urgently through the mind, than at others; and the same with regard to the voluntary power," (the power of volition).

Locke also tells us, "there is a kind of restiveness in almost every one's mind. Sometimes, without perceiving the cause, it will boggle and stand still, and one cannot get it a step forward; and at another time it will press forward, and there is no holding it in." But it is rare, indeed, to find a teacher prepared to make any allowance for this variation in the capacities of thought and perception in the youth under his charge. The universal custom of instruction is well expressed by the author of *Waverley*, in the extract from the old play, at the head of one of his chapters:

"You call this education, do you not?  
Why 'tis the forced march of a herd of bullocks,  
Before a shouting drover. The glad van  
Move on at ease, and pause a while to snatch  
A passing morsel from the dewy greensward,  
While all the blows, the oaths, the indignation,  
Fall on the croup of the ill-fated laggard  
That cripples in the rear."

Or the pedagogue may have taken a hint from the Chinese duck-herd, who has hired for his flock the privilege of feeding on some rice-field lining the canal on which he is domiciliated in his movable dwelling. The last waddler who reaches the plank leading from the shore to the boat, after the signal of return has been given, receives so severe a flagellation, that in the common anxiety to avoid it, they plunge together, in one feathered mass, overwhelming the weaker, and often threatening them with instant suffocation.

We must not, however, confine ourselves to the mental hygiene of youth alone. Age also requires our attention,

and the decline of life may have its comfort and enjoyment lengthened and promoted by proper care. The "grand climacteric," or period of culmination, varies in different individuals, families, tribes, nations and races. The duration of each separate organism depends upon a law impressed on the original germ. Vegetables, the lower animals, and man, alike offer these diversities. A flowering shrub shall last its single season, and "be resolved into the elements," while the sturdy oak and the olive—*tarde crescens*—shall last for generations, and the Baobab bid defiance to centuries. The bright butterfly shall flutter through its few hours of love and joy, and the raven croak, for two hundred years, his hoarse notes of complaint amidst the tempest. The Teuton, Englishman or American reaches, as did the ancient Hebrew, his threescore and ten, or, "by reason of strength," lingers through a few additional circles of the sun; while, if Riley and other travellers speak true, the modern Arab of the desert, and the native of interior Africa, and the Russian serf, do not complete their term under a century or two. But whenever the man begins to decline, his unity, so strongly insisted on by Feuchtersleben, declines all together—mind and body—and we must submit to the inexorable necessity.

The question as to the period is a highly complicated one. The brain, which, as I have said, is fully developed at twenty-five, shows very seldom any tokens of wear or atrophy before sixty. Up to this time the memory continues retentive—we are speaking of men in ordinary health—and the ripened judgment more than counterbalances the impairment of quickness of perception and apprehension. From fifty to sixty-five, then, unless some defect of constitution, original or accidentally impressed, have injured the individual, we may consider the man as the more perfect unit. A lustrum or two beyond sixty may be fairly given here, if we are right in supposing his stock of experience, and his wisdom, depending as it does on the maturity of prudence, and the acquisition of self-control, to be at their maximum at that age. He will not lose all this suddenly or hastily.

It has become more important to understand this topic, of superannuation, because, in our democratic country, we are inclined to shelf our seniors as soon as they begin to show the symptoms of advancing age. Nothing can

be more unreasonable. We are willing to trust men with power at a much more dangerous period, when they are as distant, on the premature ascent, from the height, as they will be after many years of decline. We say more dangerous, for as they grow older they will become more guarded and cautious. We have much to urge in defence of our Nestors of the bench, especially, but must defer it to some future occasion. Meanwhile, we entreat our readers to enlist themselves on the conservative side of this question, and reserve the gray head for counsel, entrusting enterprise and progress to the younger hand.

Our author advises the old against unduly vehement intellectual efforts. It is rare to find them stand in need of such advice. Nature, except in morbid cases, requiring the aid of therapeutics, rather than the safeguard of hygiene, when she takes away power removes propensity. But it is a matter of the most earnest inquiry, how we shall longest preserve our full capacities of thought. It involves a consideration of the whole method of living—all the non-naturals, as they have been absurdly called, air, food, sleep, clothing, and, indeed, every external agent which can influence the general system. Let us carefully avoid here the bias of any exclusive views, and consider these topics in an expansive and philosophic spirit. Customs and manners the most strongly contrasted are found consistent with high mental and bodily health. Some men eat flesh abundantly; others, equally eminent, are vegetarians. Some drink water only; others indulge in the use of wine. Some sleep long and soundly; while others rise with the dawn, or trim the midnight lamp. Some have lived in open air and sunshine; while others retire to seclusion. Some, like Newton, go through their "patient labour" in the solitary cloister; while others, like the indefatigable Brougham, are most alert in the bustle of constant excitement, social, professional and political. The choice is made instinctively, or sagaciously, by every one for himself. The rule must be, as elsewhere, the avoidance of excesses of every kind.

The usual tendency of our countrymen to run into extremes is strongly illustrated in our writings on this point. Moderation is disregarded on every side. We were, at one time in our lives, afraid that society was about to be divided by a marked line, into sots and water-drinkers, each of these parties being so vehement in their expres-



sions of contempt and censure for the moderates, who pretended to mere temperance. We have nothing to say for the drunkard, and he will say nothing for himself. Nor will we deny that the teetotaler may live long and virtuously and usefully; but he will never reach, we believe, the highest point of mental vigour. We cannot expect to find a Shakspeare, a Bacon or a Milton, a Washington or a Bonaparte, a Watt or a Fulton, a Johnson, a Goldsmith or a Webster among men fed upon slops, and doomed to quench their thirst upon milk and water only. But the genius of our country lies in exaggeration. We must "go ahead"—*extra flammantia mœnia mundi*. There is no resting place for our unquiet people. No principle is worth asserting, with any modification; no enterprize worth the undertaking, if it have a limit. Professor Sweetser offers us, on this subject, some rather contradictory views. At page 46 he speaks of the

"Almost incredible amount of moral and physical suffering arising, in the existing constitution of society, from mental inactivity."

At page 359, he says, on the other hand, very prettily:

"When loitering in the streets of Naples, I have contemplated the half-naked and houseless lazzaroni, basking, in indolent content, in the gay sunshine of their delicious climate, or devouring, with eager gratification, the scant and homely fare of uncertain charity, and watched their mirthful faces, and heard their merry laugh, and then in fancy have contrasted them with our own well-provided citizens, with their hurried step and care-worn countenances, or at their plenteous tables, despatching their meals scarce chewed, or even tasted—everywhere haunted by their restless and ambitious desires, I could not but ask myself, are *we* really any nearer the great purpose of our existence than those heedless beggars, in their 'looped and windowed raggedness?' And when each have (has) attained the final goal, is it impossible that the latter may have actually had the advantage in the sum total of human enjoyment?"

Let Juvenal answer him:

"Orandum est, ut sit mens sana in corpore sano  
Fortem posce animum et mortis terrore carentem  
Qui spatium vitæ extremum inter munera ponat  
Naturæ, qui ferre queat quoscunque labores,  
Nesciat irasci, *cupiat nihil*," etc., etc.

The truth here lies in a nutshell. It is all the result of education. We Americans coax forward the child at its

mother's knee ; urge with sharp spur the boy at school ; stimulate in every way the adolescent mind, whether in the field, the workshop, or the college class, and, having succeeded in giving every faculty the habit of ceaseless action, we find that repose has become impossible or intolerable. The ennui arising when exhausted nature can drag on no longer, and must come to a stand still, is the fruitful parent of vice and drunkenness. But the natural man always finds enjoyment in rest, alternate with moderate action ; nay, here, and here only, lies the hope of happiness—of sound mental and bodily health. To satisfy ourselves that it is, as we assert, mere matter of habit, let us regard the effect of education among the masses at home, as our author has contrasted their condition with that of masses abroad. See the difference between the town boy and the young farmer or shepherd ; between the New-Yorker, always in a hurry, and the Charlestonian, ever at leisure ; between the Yankee and the Southerner. “Your countrymen ought to be happy,” said an observing foreigner to us, an admirer of our institutions, “but they do not look so.” With faces full of anxious eagerness, their breath redolent of one narcotic, their cheeks distended with another, they hurry to and fro, busying themselves not only with their own affairs, but with everybody's else, sympathizing with the insurgent Canadian, the everthreatening Irishman, the frivolous Frenchman, the arrogant Hungarian ; at one moment loudly denouncing the trial and imprisonment of an intrusive abolitionist and kidnapper at the South, and at the next applauding, with as loud huzzas, the mobbing and lynching of Fieldmarshal Haynau, by a crowd of the virtuous administrators of justice, in the brewer's yards and gin lanes of immaculate London.

It is not easy to appreciate fairly the influence of diet upon the mental health. National and tribal habits, in regard to food, are coincident with so many other agencies, that we cannot designate their effects apart ; but it is evident that the human unit must be affected, as well in the composition of the brain as of the muscles and skin, by the elements of its customary nutrition. We may be said to have no national cookery as yet, although pies prevail in Connecticut and hoecakes in Virginia ; still, we think, being decided anti-vegetarians, that the greater quantity of animal food consumed in the South

has tended to develop the more ready frankness, impulsiveness and excitability of the planter.

Pythagoras, the first of the Greek philosophers who practised medicine, must be honoured as the earliest founder of a system of psychical dietetics. Feuchtersleben gives us, from Meiner, "as a specimen of *mental diet*," an extract from the Pythagorean "order of the day." We shall still farther condense this long extract. "The morning was spent in walking in the retired grove or quiet temple, to refresh the senses, compose their minds, and prepare for the business of the day. It was dangerous levity to consort with others before they held communion with themselves. Music assisted to dispel the mists of sleep, and attune the soul to activity. Their early walk ended, they met and devoted the cheerful hours to teaching and learning. Conversation was succeeded by gymnastic exercises, running, wrestling, throwing heavy weights at a mark, or dances, in which all parts of the body, especially the hands, were thrown into violent motion. Then they repaired to dinner, or rather a very simple breakfast, at which they took neither meat nor wine, eating during the whole day only so much bread and honey as was necessary to satisfy appetite. They walked, in the evening, in small parties, conversing; then repaired to the bath, after which they assembled before supper. Their suppers were always finished before sunset, beginning with libation and sacrifice. No larger number than ten sat together; they eat moderately of meat and vegetables, and indulged sparingly in wine. On breaking up for the night, they discoursed of the duties of life and the rules of the order, and when they lay down to sleep, relaxed their minds with reflection and the harmonies of the lyre." *Oh! fortunati nimium!*

While we accord due weight to the scriptural assertion, that "much study is weariness to the flesh," we are disposed to agree with our author, that "more disease is attributed to intellectual exertion than truth will warrant."

We proceed next to the second part of the volume containing the discussion of "the passions." Here we have much more minute detail, and yet we discover little or nothing that has not been said a hundred times. The metaphysical knots which are here cut asunder, without any effort at untying them, are numerous and diver-

sified. Passions are divided into "painful, pleasurable and mixed;" and again, into "the pure and wicked;" and the encounter with "abstract speculation" shunned abruptly, when almost admitting "the inconsistency of his views with the freedom of the will, and as tending to the doctrine of necessity." For our part, we object to all evasion, on this most important point. The freedom of will must be inculcated broadly and peremptorily, or there is an end to all ethics; the dependence of effect upon cause clearly recognized, as of practical application to our immediate purposes, or we may abandon all mental and physical therapeutics. Poor Burns preaches to us the doctrine,

"That prudent, cautious self-control  
Is wisdom's root,"

with the more impressiveness, that he had the saddest experience of its truth. We must predicate all "mental hygiene" on the assumed existence of the power of self-control.

The passions always impel to action, and nothing else can be their object and purpose. They are therefore, all of them, stimulating or excitant. We are aware that this is opposite to the received physiological notion; and our author, who never differs from the majority, of course treats of some of them as depressing. What would be the final cause—what the utility of such passions? All, alike spur us to preserve, defend or enjoy. They may be so intense, so disproportioned to the physical capacities, as to transcend the powers of action and endurance; but this is equally true of the pleasurable, which he regards as stimulant, as it is of the painful, which he considers depressing. Joy, he tells us, is as dangerous as grief. Love, the most pleasurable of all the passions, what say the poets of it—Catullus, Sappho, Moore; the philosophers and pathologists—Montaigne and Copland—of its syncope, impotence, delirium, wasting and decay? Fear, on the contrary, described as emphatically sedative, often, we know, "gives wings" and force. "Fear," says Cogan, "is the most dangerous of the passions," as we see in the insane impelled by it, and in a cornered rat. Hatred, the most painful among them, is perhaps that which confers the most violent and enduring powers of physical action.



Professor Sweetzer, as we have said, believes the influence of intellectual exertion upon health to have been much overrated; so, we think, has been the influence of the passions. We regard it as a very rare thing, that any one of them shall be directly fatal, though the books are full of such statements. Examples of chronic disease, produced by them, may perhaps be indefinitely numerous; yet even here we must allow for great exaggeration. We know not any one who has himself seen a sudden death of a person in ordinary health, from grief or joy, anger or fear. A man of apopleptic form and predisposition may find in a paroxysm of rage an exciting cause, as he would in exposure to a hot sun, or in stooping. A subject of diseased heart may rupture a ventricle, if rendered furious by contradiction; but no sound man dies from anger. When we set down mania with violence of temper, as produced by it, we mistake effect for cause. Indeed, we look upon the histories of the immediate morbid effect of the passions upon the bodily functions as being very generally apocryphal. Feuchtersleben quotes from Ideler the assertion, that "Tourtual saw a child die, as if struck with lightning, after taking the milk of its enraged nurse." This seems to be the same story that is quoted by Sweetzer from Carpenter, who quotes it from Combe, who quotes it from Von Ammon, who does not name the physician, the original witness of the fact. He, however, "was not called in until after the child's death, and found it lying in the cradle, as if asleep, and with its features undisturbed—but irrecoverably gone." Of the few other cases met with on record, and just as loosely given, the rarity leaves them to be looked upon as mere coincidences. What would become of us if angry mothers were apt to give poison from "the sacred fountains that nourish the human race."

"We are equally incredulous of the effect of passion—fear or grief—in turning the hair gray in a moment, an hour, a single night. Yet Feuchtersleben speaks of it as "a well-known phenomenon, a special physical effect of excessive grief, when the hair, more or less rapidly, *nay suddenly*, turns gray." He also seems to give credit to "the case of a woman whose whole body turned black, on her being reproached by her daughter as guilty of murder,—a fact highly available to the champions of the unity and universal brotherhood of the human race."

We class here the tales of poisoning by the saliva of persons in fits of anger, collected by Good and Wright, and sanctioned by their apparent acceptance. The wounds are of course lacerated and inflicted with furious violence—contingencies which account for all the evils stated to have followed.

We do not doubt the morbid influence, let it be noted, of protracted states of passion upon the secretions. Saliva and milk will surely be diseased—more or less poisonous—jaundice will occur, nutrition will fail, and the hair will become gray, where the frame is agitated by repeated or continuous grief, terror, hatred or jealousy. As to the last of these phenomena, the shortest period in which a detailed account of the change is recorded is from Holland. “The patient, a robust young German, suffering under various symptoms of cerebral disorder, was so severely affected by the continuance of images of a very painful kind, and the associations attending them; that his hair, in the course of about *ten weeks*, changed its colour, from being nearly black, to a grayish white.” We intend neither jest nor sarcasm, by the suggestion that the usual examples of this change suddenly occurring are among females, who, in their mental anguish or under disturbing circumstances, may have neglected to use their accustomed hair dye.

Of sympathies and antipathies, treated of by our author under the head of fear—one of his numerous metaphysical confusions—we hardly dare to say anything, so much requires to be said in order to be intelligible. Many of them seem to be absolutely inscrutable; but if we knew all the contingent conditions, it is probable that every one might be accounted for. The remembrance of some injury received; the strong impression made by some history of such injury; the consequent anticipation of evil, so promptly aroused as to appear instinctive or spontaneous, we think will go far to explain the curious facts which every one’s experience or memory has gathered, as every one can contribute his ghost story to the evening’s amusement. And this reminds us to enter our earnest protest against any interference, on the part of the commonplace hygienist or mistaken physician, with the time-honoured custom of entertaining children with tales of supernatural interest. What would the life of the young be without them—these magic-lantern exhibitions of “the

night side of nature?" For our own part, we would rather forget our metaphysics, mathematics and algebra than lose one of those treasures of early recollection. They have constituted so large a share of the zest of existence to us, that we would not deprive our children of the same pleasures for any reasons yet assigned. As to the objection of our author, and others, that "they make children afraid of the dark," we reply that it is both natural and proper that they should be so. What says Sidney Smith, the wittiest of philosophers and the most philosophical of wits? "Nature speaks to the mind of man *immediately*, in beautiful and sublime language; she astonishes him with magnitude, *appals him with darkness*, cheers him with splendour," etc.

In the dark all liability to injury and evil is augmented an hundred fold, and the instinct which teaches us to desire light (like Ajax) is a reasonable one. Fear of the dark should be made rational and controlled, like all other fear, and then we shall call it prudence and caution.

The lamented Brigham, in his excellent "Treatise of the Influence of Religion upon Health," has fallen into some of the exaggerations we are endeavouring to correct, and our author follows him, in ascribing vastly too much evil to religious fear. The strange things that we witness in assemblies, during what are called "revivals," are owing not at all to fear, but to the omnipotent influence of sympathy and imitation. We say, not to *fear* at all. They never occur but where numbers are gathered together. The profoundest conviction of guilt, the darkest terrors of hell, never gave rise to a convulsion or catalepsy, in a conversation between the pastor and his convert. But let the faces of a multitude shine on each other, let the glances of excited feeling be reflected from eye to eye, then let one shriek be heard, or one contortion seen, and universal uproar spreads around. Dr. Sweetzer, in his reference to the "Convulsionaires of St. Medard," gives examples enough of such phenomena occurring independently of fear. Those fanatics feared nothing, either in this world or the next.

The nature of these "exercises," and their variety, go to prove the same thing, whether they consist in epileptic fits, catalepsy, trance, extasy, dancing, laughing, screaming, gyrating, barking, biting, mewing or purring. With-

in our own State, we have had the barking and mewing, and most of the others are familiar. Of the Kentucky jerks described by Dr. Sweetzer, we saw one instance strongly in point. A black preacher, an élève of the excellent Blackburn, was seized while holding forth zealously and warmly. Being a very strong man, his spasmodic motions jerked those who held him so forcibly that they were thrown from side to side ; on which he apologized very courteously, in the midst of the attack, for having hurt them. We will add one or two more. A Presbyterian Church in East Tennessee had for its pastor a stern old Scotchman, who held all these movements in scorn and detestation, and denounced them vehemently from the pulpit. One Sunday, while pouring out a stream of eloquence on the subject, he was himself attacked, violently tossed about, and carried home helpless. His flock were terribly scandalized at the incident, and one of his elders, a Cameronian like him, was especially bitter upon the weakness of his minister. A few Sundays after, to the unspeakable consternation of all the beholders, this old gentleman also was taken with convulsions, as he gravely strode along the aisle towards his pew, reflecting deeply, no doubt, upon the feebleness and degeneracy of his fellow christians.

In all these events—and we might multiply the examples indefinitely—it will be seen that fear has no part. The phenomena depend upon a principle in human, or rather animal nature, of exceeding obscurity, but most pervading sway. When fully understood, its workings will explain many of the darkest mysteries of the present day. We have neither time nor space to discuss this wide topic ; it includes the magical influence of eloquence and fine writing, of poetry and music, acting and recitation, and of mesmerism and jugglery as well.

We find our author, of course, yielding a ready assent to the record of strange antipathies, and of the effects of the imagination of the mother upon the unborn offspring. Passing these without comment, we must not allow to remain uncontradicted the repetition of the commonplace statement with regard to nostalgia, that it is especially, if not exclusively, a mental affection of mountaineers. The Swiss are pointed out as peculiarly liable to it. But there never has been a people so remarkable for voluntary itinerancy as they ; notorious, to a proverb, for serving as mer-



cenaries in every country of Europe, through the middle ages, and until now. The love of home exists universally, and it is slander to say that the denizens of plains are in any degree wanting in this virtuous instinct. The low country Carolinian is as much attached to his rice-field and hunting ground as the Tyrolese to his Alps; and the Chinese rarely cuts off his tail, during his longest peregrinations, wearing it ever, as a token of his unchangeable determination to go back to the Celestial land. Wherever "home" is known, and known to be the seat of true comfort, wherever men habitually prize

"Domestic happiness, the only bliss  
Of Paradise that has survived the fall,"

there will emigration be rare, and among the natives of that region will nostalgia be frequent. But we are disposed to think, with Feuchtersleben, that this mental condition "has been unnecessarily classed among the proper psychopathies, and that we might, with as much reason, establish an apodemialgia, or longing for foreign countries." If this latter suggestion be received, and the contrast to the Swiss disease be allowed a place in our nosologies, we will fix its locality, as a permanent and prevailing endemic, among the Down-Easters—the "universal Yankee nation."

The chapter on suicide comes next. We doubt, despite the authority of our learned German with the hard name, "that *this* is a peculiar form of psychopathy," any more than nostalgia. It is simply, and always, the effect of the extinction of hope—despair of the removal of some evil felt to be insupportable; it is much more commonly the result of severe or protracted physical suffering than has been admitted. His readiness to believe is prodigious. He tells us, somewhere, that "Garrick, after acting Lear or Othello, passed hours in convulsions;" that "in the Spleen Club, in England, two members annually had the right to put an end to their existence;" and that "a beam ran across one of the streets of London, offering such convenience for hanging, that some individuals, daily, suspended themselves from it, until it was removed by the police." In the few authentic instances in which the sudden desire to die seems to have taken possession of the mind, it is because a long cherished wish has found some peculiar facility of gratification, in the suggestion

of some easy mode of death, or the prompting of some convenient evasion. The obscure principle formerly spoken of, call it what you will, sympathy or imitation, acts readily upon a subject previously overwhelmed or desperate, and self-destruction follows.

Nor do we believe in the existence of any of the other forms of monomania, as so generally recognized. Well may legislators be puzzled with the doctrine, that a single faculty, intellectual or moral, may become exclusively diseased; and that one person shall feel an irrepressible desire to commit adult-murder, and another child-murder; another, labouring under pyromania, be irresistibly impelled to set fire to something, or under kleptomania to steal something, and so on. Nothing can be more absurd than such a belief, unless it be the inference that we are not to punish these aberrations. If the other portions of the brain be sound, as is maintained expressly by those who have imagined such nicely limited change in an organ entirely analogous in composition, if the rest of the brain be sound and the other mental and moral faculties in the ordinary state of regular activity, let us aid them to control the morbid and insane propensity,—by urging strongly upon the subject the powerful motives, familiar and efficient—encouraging him in the virtuous struggle by the hope of reward, and deterring him from crime by the fear of punishment.

Shame is amusingly treated of by Prof. Sweetzer, who defines it to “consist in wounded pride or self-love.” Did he ever see an arch little baby in arms hiding its sweet innocent face on its nurse’s shoulder, ashamed, or affecting to be so? Has he not read the story of Laura Bridgman, who, in her early childhood, always shrunk from the touch of her guardian, or any other male friend, while she eagerly passed her hands over the dress of every female near her, to ascertain all that she was curious to know of her visitors, and who, all blind and deaf-mute as she was, would never permit her doll to be seen by her instructor until decorously dressed or covered? “Shame, without guilt,” says some deep-thinking Teuton, “is the greatest mystery in nature.” It is certainly an emotion far too complicated for our author’s insight.

When we reach the section appropriated to the “mixed passions,” we are astonished to find there sexual jealousy, under the same head with ambition and avarice, the wor-

thy themes of many a "Sophomore composition" in our colleges, quite as profound and instructive as the chapter before us. We hold the opinion that there are in the human breast but two passions absolutely and entirely evil—jealousy and envy. Anger and hatred, besides being useful in their way, are not destitute of some sort of pleasantness. Burns' dame, in Tam O'Shanter,

"Nursing her wrath, to keep it warm,"

must have felt it so; and Tom Moore, quarrelling with one of his mistresses, sings,

"To love thee was pleasant enough,  
But oh! 'tis delicious to hate thee."

Grief, too, with all its gloom, is, in view of the poets, who best understand the philosophy of the passions, of as mingled character. Ossian describes "the memory of joys that are past as pleasant and mournful to the soul." Montgomery tells us of the "joy of grief." Moore exclaims, "Go—let me weep! there's bliss in tears;" and Shakspeare makes his Constance "fond of grief." Fear has its delights, as we can trace in the visages of the little circle gathered around the hearth of a stormy winter night, to hear of the death-bed horrors "of him who robbed the orphan," and to have their blood curdled, and their hair made "to stand on end," by a tale of murder, witchcraft, or awful apparition of ghost or demon.

But jealousy—and the form here specified by our author above all, sexual jealousy—is the source of the most intense mental tortures, unmitigated by any conceivable alloy. "*Uret jecur*," says Horace; the liver is roasted, the heart swells to bursting, the brain is on fire, the soul rages with malignity and envy, and the whole man—the unit—is overwhelmed with madness, fury and despair. A "mixed passion!" Mixed, like the hell-broth of Shakspeare's witches, and Burns' catalogue of curiosities, of

"All things horrible and awful,  
Which e'en to name would be unlawful,"

combining every detestable emotion which can disturb the moral faculties.

Lastly, we have a chapter on the imagination, which straggles in under no particular head of intellectual ope-

ration or passion, and, after a prolix enumeration of trite platitudes, from a great variety of sources, classical, Scotch-metaphysical and poetical, we reach the concluding remarks. Among these we notice the "old familiar" legends of Col. Townshend's voluntary dying and coming to life again—a mere rehearsal of his permanent death, which took place a few hours after. This was nothing at all, compared with the long death and burial of the Indian juggler, witnessed by several officers of the British army, who saw him revive, upon disinterment, after a month.

The last story in the volume is a good, and really interesting one; and, as illustrative of the effects of *expectation*, or, if the author will have it so, of imagination, and well adapted to explain many of the vaunted cures wrought by mesmerism, and other charlataneries, we will insert it here, to round off our long paper.

"Dr. Paris, in his Pharmacologia, has recorded an instance related to him by Mr. Coleridge, strongly illustrative of the physical effects of imagination. When the peculiar action of the exhilarating gas was first discovered, it was inferred by Dr. Beddoes that it must necessarily be a specific for palsy, and a patient was therefore selected for the trial, and the management of it entrusted to Sir Humphrey Davy. Previous to the administration of the gas, he inserted a small pocket-thermometer under the tongue of the patient, as he was accustomed to do on such occasions, to ascertain the degree of animal temperature, with a view to future comparison. The paralytic man, wholly ignorant of the nature of the process to which he was to submit, but deeply impressed, from the representation of Dr. Beddoes, with the certainty of its success, no sooner felt the instrument under his tongue than he concluded the talisman was in full operation, and, in a burst of enthusiasm, declared that he already experienced the effect of its benign influence throughout his whole body. The opportunity was too tempting to be lost—Davy cast an intelligent glance at Coleridge, and desired his patient to renew his visit on the following day, when the same ceremony was performed, and repeated every succeeding day for a fortnight, the patient gradually improving during that period, when he was dismissed as cured, no other application having been used."

D.

---



## ART. III.—THE GENIUS AND WRITINGS OF THACKERAY.

1. *The Great Hoggarty Diamond*. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1848.
2. *Vanity Fair*. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1849.
3. *The History of Pendennis; his fortunes and misfortunes; his friend and his greatest enemy*. By W. M. THACKERAY. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1850.

IN this strange and most unlooked for age, when every man is his own metaphysician, the tyro (alas! no longer the enthusiastic neophyte) has barely time to shave off his first pair of whiskers, and to forget Dean Swift and Lord Bolingbroke, when he finds himself gazing tranquilly from an intellectual height, which even those two far-sighted worthies never suspected the possibility of. The philosopher's stone and the elixir of life have at last passed away from the most morbid dreams of the most brainsick of men. The spirit of the age has got to be so practical, that the sensations of universal surprise and astonishment are things unknown. The learned man of Laputa could not now extract sunbeams from the cucumber a single week, but every village newspaper would have explained the philosophy of the process to every country gossip at every ale house in christendom. The generation *in esse* have even ceased to tell of the good old times of their fathers, but expect, themselves, to see the mail bag and passengers carried through the air by a dragon, breathing fire and smoke from his mouth and nostrils, and steam from behind his wings. The writ of *ca. sa.* has become a tradition, like the knee breeches and rapiers of our fathers. The double-chinned and many-coated coachman disappeared with so ludicrous a celerity, that the author of *Pickwick* had just time to take his daguerreotype; and other artists, who strove for a memento mori likeness of the old fellow, have given us but an indistinct, misty resemblance, which none recognize or are interested in. Some of us, perhaps, live in a sort of dreamy hope that our children will feed on bread made at a minute's warning, by compressing azote and oxygen with a galvanic press.

Not only have the investigations of the age been pushed into every nook and corner of the external and tangible, but a regard tenfold, with respect to that of any other

epoch, is paid to all the humours and fancies of the imagination, as well as to all the foolish, dull and crudy vapours which environ the brain. It would almost seem that each individual of the vast mass, from the senator to the squatter, is, in these days, a reader. And, countless as the number of readers are, the number of books, if possible, more than keep pace with them. There are, literally, books of all kinds, to suit the tastes of all men, from the little yellow-backed translations under the counter, to Scott's Commentaries upon it. For a dollar, you can put yourself in possession of a fund of knowledge which would have been worth a kingdom to your ancestor, who died this time a hundred years ago. For half the money, you may enjoy a stream of humour and wit, for a whole summer's day, which old Falstaff would have shaken his fat sides at. Pathos, rich and rare, is a drug in the market; so is religion, belles lettres, argument, adventure, law.

Who, with a knowledge of human nature, would have expected, in such an age as this, that there would have risen among us a writer who, with humour, caustic and biting, would draw us off a picture of men and manners, a picture neither softened nor exaggerated. And yet, *mirabile dictu et etiam mirabilis credere*, such is the case. It is as though we should, while hurrying through the plaza of some crowded and dusty city, suddenly come upon a group of green young poplars, with a bold and gushing spring of water bursting from amidst their roots. It would not surprise us to find there a magnificent park, laid off with exquisite taste, and surrounded on all sides by a fine fence of iron. It would not surprise us, when we had paid our fee, with an affectation of careless indifference, and walked in, that we should find there any number of beautiful fountains, with any number of beautiful devices, humorous designs, and chaste and touching representations. It would not surprise us that we should find rustic seats, grouped, with fine stage effect, around each jet d'eau; that the branches of the trees should be gracefully arched above, and that the grass should be shaven smooth as velvet around. We should, perchance, be amused for the hour, and could easily comprehend the delight of the cits and city dames, who would throng the park of Sunday evenings. But yet, although the wise-acres and Sir Oracles among these cits should bawl themselves hoarse with pointing out to us the natural contor-

tions with which this vine is made to entwine around that tree, or the charming abruptness with which that green old stump is made to appear among these roses, we should soon tire of it all, and say with disgust, as we wended our hasty way back to the poplar spring, Procul, Oh procul este profani ! Even so do we joyfully turn from the crowded shelves of our library, to the table where Thackeray's last number is lying.

We pronounce Mr. Thackeray to be the greatest delineator of human nature, who has written in English, since the day of Fielding. The compliment is so high, and the sentence so broad and sweeping, that we are prepared to have our opinion condemned, at first sight, by many, as being puerile and exaggerated in the extreme, both as to the conception and the expression of it. We speak not lightly nor unadvisedly, however ; and, after a careful and deliberate re-perusal of *Vanity Fair*, his only finished novel, and the one, we presume, on which his fame will principally rest, we farther pronounce him, unhesitatingly, to be, in our opinion, with the single exception of Sir Walter Scott, the greatest writer of the present century. The qualities of a great writer are of so high an order, that we may perhaps be excused for going somewhat at length, in speaking of them, into an apparent digression from our present subject.

It has been well said, that gesticulation, painting and words form, at last, but the three different methods of doing the same thing. They are different, both as to their modes of operating and their degrees of excellence ; but, as we have nothing to do at present with the two first, we will not write farther about them, or about their glorious bastard-brother, music, the Angus McAulay of the family. They are all, in fact, but different vehicles, by which thought is communicated from one individual of the human family to others ; and the analogy between them is so strong, that a recollection of their similarity can never be uninteresting, either to the philosopher or the casual observer. The amusement is not confined to children, which is derived from an observation of the fact that our primeval ancestors were not only inclined to misconceive the nature of so much that we understand, but that they were often singularly prone to believe the very reverse of what we know to be truth. It would have, doubtless, seemed an almost ludicrous falsity, to the

wisest of the Chaldeans, to have been told that the fame of that genius whose labours were expended on exquisite sculpture, or the building of mighty cities, or the overthrow of powerful empires, would have grown dimmer and dimmer, until it had faded from the sight of posterity, whilst efforts of intellect that were committed to words—things common to all, and for so many centuries made of nothing but sound caused by human breath, and passed at will from mouth to mouth—should prove, at the end of thousands of years, ten times more refulgent, and ten thousand times more durable, than the fame of all the Pharaohs. How strange would it have sounded to one of the old brazen-armed kings, had he been told that that blind old beggar, Homer, who sang songs for him and his mates to feast by, and was glad to get a share of the broken meat they left, like a beggar as he was, would be the wonder and delight of mankind, when the remotest recollection of them would have faded from earth, “like the baseless fabric of a vision.” Who will say that we have not a better idea of the Greek from the preservation of one of Demosthenes’ speeches, than we would have from the preservation of every temple and statue that the eyes of Pericles ever rested on? Or, what idea could we have had of the Augustan age, without the works of Ovid, of Horace, or of Virgil.

The unrivalled power and supremacy of the writer over all the other sons of men is not in these days, simply, a favourite hyperbole with poets. Neither is it a dogma of any sect of philosophers. It is a proposition, trite and common to the last degree—one perfectly uncalled for, but which, being made, is admitted at once and unhesitatingly by all. There is not, within the circle of our acquaintance, a man whose path in life has not been determined or influenced, either directly or indirectly, by views which have been promulgated and sustained, or deprecated, by books. There are few who have not been touched, and amused, and instructed, and who do not depend, perhaps unknowingly to themselves, for a great part of their pleasure in life, upon the thousand and one writers of the day. Let the press, everywhere, be stopped for a single year, and we would feel as if one broad pall, like the sky, covered all things. None, in fact, but the blind by nature, or the wilfully blind, can be ignorant of the great truth, that, in the last few generations, the face of the earth has



been changed, not only morally but physically, so that those who once lived here would not now recognize the place. And none but the wilfully blind, or the blind by nature, are ignorant that this change is owing to the light emitted from the press, more indescribably magnificent than if each leaden type sent forth ten million solar rays.

He that revolves these things in his mind can by no means be surprised that there should be, at the present day, such an uninterrupted flood of books, of every shape, size and dimension, pouring forth upon the world. There is not in the human breast a passion more deep-rooted, nor one more indigenous to the soil, than the love of present and posthumous fame. Is it not a wonder, then, since words and opinions, if not ideas, are common to all, that the number of writers is not *legio legionum*, instead of *legion*? That such is the case, we are far from believing is a thing to be regretted. We acknowledge, with infinite thankfulness, that there is in this, as in every thing else, a counteracting principle in nature. To be known as a writer, one must be known by being read, and the same innate love of self which makes men thrust such unconscionable masses of their own writing on the world, as long as the world will look at them—the same principle, we say, keeps the many-headed from reading any thing but what has merit in it, or what they fancy to have merit—which comes to the same thing. Evil befall him who would wish to see the privilege taken from them. We should lie, egregiously, however, were we to say that we are not provoked an hundred times, between Christmas and midsummer, by the perverseness with which they persist on retaining it, and the wretched stupidity which they exhibit in the use of it.

It seems a little strange at times, that the art of writing, which has no limit to its perfection, should, in some degree, be common to all who want it. The other arts have all had their hosts of devotees; but, as a general rule, few have followed any of them with any think like success, who were not encouraged to do so by a consciousness of natural talent for the path they chose to pursue. The merit which is exhibited in painting, or sculpture, or the histrionic art, is striking and obvious, while the want of it is equally perceptible. The writer of books, on the contrary, though devoid of genius, has often sufficient skill to give his works so high a polish, that, like a mock

diamond, only the passage of time over them, can, by showing their dimness in another light, make their defective and artificial nature apparent to all eyes. In other arts, too, the great law, that merit consists in the closeness of the resemblance to nature, and not in the wideness of the departure from it, is clear and unmistakeable. The actor who attempts to depict the passion of love by a perpetual wailing out of sickly sighs, or who represents rage by an undue growling and gnashing of the teeth, invariably gets hissed, sooner or later. For the artist, more allowance is made, and yet the highest commendation ever bestowed upon his *chef d'œuvre* is the exaggerated compliment that it looks as natural as reality.

It would seem that, by an almost incredible portion of the mass of readers, the superiority of nature over art is a thing either unknown or not recognized. We have often wished, just by way of curiosity, that it could be known how great a proportion of Shakspeare's readers would see any beauty in the conception of Falstaff or Lady Macbeth, if the characters could be presented to them as the productions of Hobbes of Malmsbury. Whether a goodly number of them, if the truth could be known, do not really think the *Beaux Stratagem* as admirable a comedy as *Twelfth Night*.

We believe, however, that, fortunately, readers of this class are in the minority, and that this minority is becoming smaller and smaller, year by year, as the human race is becoming more and more enlightened. We are not one of those who believe that all men can eventually be brought to see even a part of the beauties of Shakspeare; but a proof of our proposition, and we hold it far from an inconclusive one, is the fact, that really preposterous works of fiction are rapidly going out of date. They have had their day, and now are seldom attempted to be forced on the market. Authors are, in these days, too wise to inflict upon us love letters seven pages long, and two duels, at full length, is a pretty fair quote for two volumes. Modern heroines, as a general thing, seldom swoon more than three times during the progress of the story, and it is only such interminable scribblers as G. P. R. James, who have not yet ceased to make the finale consist of the hero's turning out to be somebody else's son than his putative father's. Even in poetry, which is to literature what statues of the Venus, or pictures of Christ,

and the Madonna are to sculpture and painting, people are not inclined to be bored by pirates and brigands, whose eyes flash fire all the time, and whose lips are in a perpetual quiver, with the agony of suppressed emotion. The whilome minority, (now a majority,) that has always been here, and to whom we owe so much, are convinced that it is easier to draw monsters than men; and, as it does its jewels and every thing else, it would love the men found in books, if for no other reason than on account of their rarity. We solemnly believe, however, that, let them be given to us as often and in as great numbers as possible, they will always be greeted with a shout of delight and a hearty shake of the hand. It is only in books that a member of the human family can enjoy all the pleasures of companionship with his kind, without a single drop of bitterness or of sourness to mar the happiness of the draught. It is in this way, alone, that he can sympathize with the proud and consult with the shy; that he can enjoy the company of the great without feeling his own littleness, and go along, cheek by jowl, with the little, without feeling himself lowered, or have his darling little pride tarnished in the eyes of others. It is in this way, alone, that he can, in his robe and slippers, and in full possession of the lazy comforts of his bed room, enjoy the society of the gay, the brilliant and the witty, without feeling called on to exert himself in shining with them, and without fear of being thrown into the shade by the contrast.

What can be more natural, since such is the case, than that we should joy in meeting upon paper, men, women and children, like those we know, and are familiar with, in every day life. There is an exulting feeling in the reader's breast, that himself and this brave author understand each other. The reader takes full credit to himself, after the fashion of human kind, for being one link in the chain along which is passed that electric current, yecept sympathy, between great minds; whereas, what he takes for such keen and unerring appreciation, on his part, is but a simple and most natural recognition of what he has seen all his life.

The art of thus holding the mirror up to nature has not disappointed the experience of the world, with respect to every other art. The perfection of it seems so natural and easy of performance, that it would be strange if there

were fewer who confidently expected to attain to that immortal name, which seems to them within their grasp. Men love the product of their own labour, and that love, like every other, in some measure blinds them. Except, then, with the few mental reservations of single self to each single author, all those who are writers, as well as those who are not, freely own that, of the countless millions who have published since the press was invented, the number of those who have succeeded in giving even a tolerable representation of life, as it is, might be counted on our fingers, without giving a great deal of trouble. Whilst those who have drawn human nature boldly, freely and accurately, are few in the extreme—so few, that it is difficult to believe we know or can recollect them.

Of these few, Shakspeare undoubtedly stands, like Saul, a head and shoulders above the tallest, not only of those who have written in English, but of all those who have written, perhaps ever spoken, in any language used by the sons of men. It would not be an exaggeration to say, that, of all the wonders now known on earth, or which we know to have existed, the plays of Shakspeare, as being the work of one mind, present at once the greatest and most incomprehensible. The majesty of intellect which the man must have been possessed of, is to us a thing inconceivable, and greater than the mind can take in. If we are to judge of him by his works, to finite capacities his intellectual power seems infinite; and yet, strange to say, these unrivalled productions are evidently but scintillations, struck from him by that hardest of all earthly hammers, necessity. He was careless and indifferent about their preservation, reckless with regard to the immortality which, no man man knew better than himself, would never have a rival in the after history of the world. He is, in all probability, the only human being that ever lived, of whom it may be said, that, if a copy of his writings could be studied by an inhabitant of another sphere, equal, but not superior to the inhabitants of this, such unearthly visitor might come among us, not as one who had awakened from a strange dream and was yet bewildered, but as a man amongst men, who had seen much of life, and was become wise and witty from great experience. How great beyond expression must have been the mind that was not unworthy to draw upon paper a faithful and accurate sketch of the Almighty's work-



manship. This Shakspeare did. He has not only shown us the world we live in, as one great whole, in its vast proportions of sea and land, of mountain and plain, with navies riding upon the water, and mighty armies waging war on the land. but he has, as it were, taken us into the forest, and pointed out the big oaks and vines which twine around them. He has made us observe the flowers which are half hidden in the grass, and the roses that grow in corners and secluded spots. He has shown us every tree and every group of trees, how they are separately, and how they mingle together, with their branches shoving and twisting, by and between and against each other. He has shown us the land covered with weeds, as well as that which is craggy and sterile. He has shown us the arid deserts, as well as the lakes and lochs, rivers and brooks. Ever and anon, he has brought us upon scenes so beautiful that we are drunk with their beauty, others so grand and magnificent that we are dazzled with the view, and others, again, so sublime, that the hardest of us pause, at once awed and humbled into reverence and lowliness.

Knowing these things, (and to whom is it not all familiar?) we have no wonder left within us wherewith to wonder, if he were really, what so many of the lesser fry would fain have been thought to be—a man whose eye pierced alike to the inmost heart of the king and the peasant, who saw that it was all alike vanity and vexation of spirit, and who was unfeignedly contemptuous of the world's opinion, either as it came from the palace or the hovel. Truly, the sod which grows around the old tombstone, upon the banks of Avon, is more honoured than all Westminster Abbey.

After taking leave of Shakspeare, how long it is before we come, in English literature, to another writer who can afford to display the defects and negligences which would sink other writers, who might even be said to be above mediocrity. Not such an one do we find among his contemporaries, or among those writers of the drama who immediately succeeded him. We see them, in a great measure, by their proximity to him, as to a mighty light, and we see them fainter and fainter, as they leave him. Not such an one do we find among the bold and and flashy writers of the drama who came in after the restoration. and whose merit consisted chiefly in wit and

humour, which was displayed by exhibitions of licentiousness, and subtle appeals to animal passion. Not such an one was Pope, the caustic, or Addison, the chaste, or Richardson, who wrote the first novel, which, let people say what they will, must have been a sea of pleasure to swim in, to the race of men who read *Amadis de Gaul* and the history of Sir Launcelot, or Don Beliano of Spain.

Immediately after Richardson, however, and treading on his heels, with a gleeful depth of sarcasm which can never be rivalled, we come upon Henry Fielding, who, assuredly, ranks next to Shakspeare, of all the English writers. Of him, alone, can it be said, that he is as peerless a writer of fiction as Shakspeare is of the drama. If he stands upon a lower stage, he stands upon one which is an hundred fold more crowded, and he keeps as undisputed possession of his throne. Fielding has furnished the world with another instance of a mind of exquisite genius being combined, by a moral species of chemical affinity, with the incurable tastes and habits of a natural vagabond. The good-natured rake and debauchee had perhaps seen more of life in a single week, than the shrewdest of our modern authors see in a year. He had often, in a year, seen more of the world than they see in a lifetime. The history of literature shows us that the great original writers almost invariably were the first to enter upon the separate fields they chose to move in, where they might find no previous path, and no precedent to follow but the dictates of nature. So it was with Homer, the Greek, and Ossian, the Celt, with Cervantes and Le Sage, with Shakspeare, the dramatist, Milton, the sacred poet, and with Fielding, unsurpassed, as a delineator of nature, by the authors of *Don Quixote* and *Gil Blas*, and unrivalled by any writer of prose in his own language. So perfect are his representations of life, that it is more difficult to look upon his characters as fictitious beings, than as the actual relations and acquaintances that we have known from childhood. He reminds us, irresistibly, of Shakspeare's pithy observation, so worthy of its author, that "one touch of nature makes the whole world kin."

Of the score of inns which we stop at with him, we find a score of landlords and landladies, not so many units of the species innkeeper, but so many different individuals of the human race. The same may be said of every be-

ing that he calls by name, from the lady of quality down to the beggar who is casually passed on the road-side, or the post-boy, who only leaves his horse at the door, and passes on. We see what he tells us, as though we saw it with our bodily eyes, and we hear what is said, as though we heard it with the ears of the flesh. It is for this reason that we "laugh till our face looks like a wet cloak all laid up," at the adventures of Parson Adams, and it is for this reason that our lip involuntarily quivers, and our heart throbs so often, while reading them. In what other author's hands would honest Tom have been any thing but a disgusting puppy, or the nonpareil old Squire have been any thing but a more disgusting bore? So powerfully and so unmistakably, however, are they drawn, that, upon a second reading, there is a feeling of almost melancholy mingled with our mirth, as though we had been recalling intimate friends, acquaintances and enemies, whom we knew a century ago, and who are now mouldering in the dust, with the mighty genius who produced them. We doubt much if there will ever be another author who will be able to tell plainly all the errors and weaknesses of youth, and yet, by the exquisite simplicity with which it is told, make the young man be, what he would really have been in life, the favourite of every class of society.

The road which Fielding opened has been trod, since his day, by a multitude, which it would be vain to attempt any enumeration of, and an account of whom would be more than useless, if it were practicable. If he ever had a rival, it was his illustrious contemporary, Smollet, an author who, in *Humphrey Clinker*, at least, has shown that, although a degree below the author of *Tom Jones*, he better deserves the honour of being called Fielding's rival than any other novelist of that day or this. Since then, we assert that, as a correct delineator of life, Mr. Thackeray is superior to any other writer of fiction in English, or, we believe, in any other language. The contrast between him and the other fashionable writers of the day redounds to his credit in every instance. We do not make an exception of Dickens, and assuredly we make no exception of any other author. He excels them as far in the knowledge and correct portraiture of human nature, as they excel him in artfully weaving the story which they tell, so as to excite and sustain an interest in

the reader's mind, until the finale is arrived at. The story of one of Mr. Thackeray's novels is absolutely nothing; by which we mean not that he does not, like other novelists, narrate a series of fictitious events, by which the reader's interest is kept alive to the end, but that he uses the story as a means, and not as an end. He is, in fact, a great metaphysician, who goes, more than any other writer of the day, not only to the very ground-work of society, but to the root and spring of the actions of men, in all the complex and manifold relations in which they stand to themselves and to each other.

It is impossible to read a hundred pages, in any of his works, without being struck with the fact that the man is describing life as he himself has seen it, and not as it is learned from the experience of others. It is very far from being every novelist, even among those of reputation, of whom this can be said. In fact, the best delineators of character, which we find in ninety-nine out of a hundred, strike us irresistibly as being, like the wax on a bee's thigh, a concoction gathered from the sweets of every flower that the author has passed over. For each character, however badly drawn, whose original seems to have been a being in actual life, we find scores who, although cleverly introduced and cleverly sustained, are evidently but pleasurable phantasma—things begotten upon the author's imagination, by a combination of what he has read, what he has heard, and what he has himself seen and been deluded by, as well as what he has seen and understood. It would be doing a great and manifest injustice to others, to say that this is not bound to be the case, in some measure, from the very nature of things, in every work of fiction. It is reserved, however, for the raræ aves, authors of great and original merit, like Mr. Thackeray, of whose works it can be said that the fiction consists only in the names which are used, and the poor reality of the time, place and circumstance narrated. If we might be allowed a professional simile, we should say that a volume by the author of *Vanity Fair* reminds us of an action of ejectment, in which an imaginary Richard Roe disputes the title to certain demesnes, with an imaginary John Doe, and the one proceeds to take possession thereof himself, and to expel the tenant in possession, for which John Doe brings suit; beneath which harmless gasconade, and under cover of it all, matters of great



moment, of really deep and complex nature, and of weighty interest, are tried, judged of, and determined.

Thackeray has, unlike Dickens, taken an evident pride in delineating every species of individual composing the highest classes of society. The only way in which a thoroughly graphic idea of men and manners can be conveyed by words, is, as in painting, by putting down, in an apparently unstudied manner, but with perfect accuracy, the little, minute, and, to appearance, trifling detail of life. The ocean is not more certainly made up of drops, than is life composed of these trifles, light as air. It is only the great writer, however, like the great artist, who really knows how completely the perfection of the grand whole depends upon the just proportions, the subtle shading, and the accurate representation of the relation that each bears to the others, and they to it. This analogy between writer and painter holds good, with singular exactness, from alpha to omega. The less talented author, like the commoner painter, dwells upon the sharpest outlines, the most striking features, and the most decided hues. When the picture proves gaudy and unpleasing to nice eyes, he either does not believe that such is the case, or cannot see wherein his own deficiency lies. That feeling of contempt, which is exhibited by curling the lip, is the easiest of all grades of the feeling to draw. A boy can draw it on the wall with a bit of charcoal, and do the thing more fairly, too; for his untutored mind has not been brought to the nicety of calling the same thing, when it is done by a gentleman or lady, curling the lip, which, when done by the valet or lady's maid, is denominated, shortly, turning up the nose. We wonder it has never entered into the brain of the legion of novelists by whom the press is filled to overflowing, that it really gives the spleen, not only to those "*qui mores hominum multorum et urbes vidit*," but to all men of sense, to have it perpetually forced upon them, that, when a man is angry his eyes dash, or to have the fact of a man walking off by night expressed by saying that a moment after his tall form was seen gliding swiftly into the darkness. Vide Ernest Maltravers, etc., etc., etc., without number. If the reader of this has ever been able to imagine Ernest Maltravers riding up to the door of an inn, as all of mortal mould must have done in their day, and there dismounting in a far from leisurely manner, and immediately upon

entering the house demanding of the landlord whether or not he can have dinner without delay, and telling, at the same time, in the decisive tone of an earnest man, that he was not very particular with regard to quality—if the reader, we say, can imagine this, his imagination has a stronger wing than our own.

It may be urged, and, at first view, not without an appearance of reason, that it is taking far from tenable ground, to say that really great depth of intellect is requisite to a faithful portraiture of even a great deal more than the forms, the humdrum commonplaces and the chit-chat of every day life. We all know, and can at any time call to mind, jolly companions of our own, who can, or once could, recount humorous adventures so naturally, that the joke seemed unwontedly ludicrous, and the point of it doubly keen, coming from their lips. This power, however, is infinitely more rare than one would believe, without calling to mind and analyzing the best of these stories, at which we have so often laughed in spite of ourselves. We have been often astonished to find, upon a philosophical investigation, how much of our enjoyment had depended upon some peculiar look, tone or gesture, which had accompanied and illustrated the verbal narration. We believe that Sam Footes are not so very uncommon; but, divest them of that part that consists of humour, and how many, think you, would prove to be Garricks? We would not be understood to say that men may not often be found, capable of giving one an exact idea—or almost an exact idea—of impressions produced by singular occurrences; but we assert that it is very seldom indeed we find a man who can do so upon paper, or who can, with pen and ink, so describe an unknown person to you that you would recognize him, morally and personally, upon seeing him. Were this, however, the extent of Mr. Thackeray's power, albeit we think it would entitle him to a higher stand in the literary world than any of his living rivals are entitled to, we freely own that he would not be deserving of the high praise we claim for him. All we contend for is that the capability of representing the words and actions of men so naturally as to make us, in spite of ourselves, look on them as real rather than as fictitious characters, is a power which is confined to writers of very great merit, and is one which is absolutely necessary to the great novelist, than whom

there is no greater unit, at the present day, among the writers of books.

This power Mr. Thackeray has in the highest degree, and he is the only living writer, within our knowledge, who has it. For the want of it, *Corinne*, a work of great genius, a compact volume of poetry, passion and sentiment, will slowly but surely retire from the busy world, until it is only to be found in the antiquary's library. Its best things will be stolen, or boldly taken, and given back to the world, in a more acceptable form, by less talented men. He who has observed the revolutions in all things, which each generation brings forth, can have but little doubt that this will surely be—Sir James Mackintosh to the contrary notwithstanding.

We assert (and who can deny our assertion?) that human nature can never be correctly portrayed by the most voluminous detail of abstract truths concerning it. The term human nature is every whit as vague as the term animal nature would be. It is one of the terms, found in every language, which cannot be defined, and which needs no defining. It is, in fact, a term which men use in speaking of that which they can comprehend, without being able to understand; in speaking of what so many pretend to know, without knowing; and which many know, without being able to explain; which the lowest knows something of, and the highest knows but imperfectly; which is meaner than any thing we know of, while it is by far the greatest thing we know; which, by its own greatness and its own weakness, has been unjustly made, by those who would be but dust without it, a very pack-horse, on whose back a world-full of human beings cast the sins that they dare not own, and cannot part with; the one thing that we are never without, and are never able to conceal, any more than it can conceal us; the thing which we first had on coming upon earth, and shall last leave on going out of it. Surely, we were correct in saying that no idea can be given of it by the best digested compendium of all the knowledge that the experience of man has taught him on the subject.

There can, we submit, be no higher object for the ambition of the intellectual man, than to make it the object of his life to help his kind to understand themselves and their mates. To the men who have the greatest pretensions in this way, of late years, these indefinite and am-

biguous terms are invaluable. The great writers of the German school take for subjects the whole range of metaphysics that have any bearing upon the connection of soul and body—the very problems which are such annoying puzzles to children between the ages of one and six. The reader, as a general thing, would freely own, if asked beforehand, that he knows next to nothing on the subject; but the writer envelopes that little in such a cloud of words and phrases, that he is made to believe terrible and appalling mysteries have always surrounded him, without his knowledge, and to feel like one just now shown the brink of a precipice, on whose very edge he has been unconsciously standing. As Thackeray would say, what strange disclosures would there be in *Vanity Fair*, if it could be known how many of us have been awed, in our time, by the purest bombast! We have been dazzled and mystified by the mass of words heaped upon the broad foundation which life offers as a subject to the writer; and when, in our confusion, we have come, here and there, upon sentences of good enough, hard sense, they have seemed, for the moment, like actual scintillations from an inspired mind. So a current of electricity, which, in the common light of day, would pass unnoticed, when seen to appear on the face of a thick black cloud, almost startles us by its brilliancy. Infinite credit would be theirs, but that, like *Macbeth's* witches, they first raise the cloud themselves.

To our mind, it seems as absurd to attempt giving a correct idea of life, by a volume of speculations, assertions and propositions, as it would be to write a purely philosophical and speculative treatise on wit and humour. One good, laughable story, would pour a flood of light on the man who had spent a lifetime in the study of such treatises. In the same manner, a better idea of life as it is, can be had from such a writer as Mr. Thackeray, than from the deepest, gravest, and most interminable ponderer that ever essayed to pass through a thick fog, such as wiser men avoid, and there (being lost) mistook every transient sunbeam for a glance into heaven, and every saw-pit for a glance into hell.

We again assert that, in our opinion, Mr. Thackeray is by far the best delineator of this “working day world” of any living author. We never read a chapter of his writing without being reminded of the favourite remark of



the Rev. Dr. Lindsley, before we had yet emerged from the wing of our alma mater: viz., that Robinson Crusoe had almost as good an opportunity of studying human nature as ever falls to the lot of man. He had with him the only thing which puts on no disguise to a bold, a determined and a just thinker, to wit, his own heart. Thus Shakspeare studied the nature of man; thus Fielding studied it; and thus, we assert, Thackeray alone, of modern authors, seems to have gone to the very fountain of the stream. The writer who has so learned his lesson is little apt to be deceived by the external show and manner with which the world attempts to hide the motives which actuate its conduct, in nearly all that it does. From such a writer, and from such alone, these limbs and outward flourishes conceal nothing, because, as it were, he has crossed the stage, and gone behind the scenes, with his eyes open. He has seen red paint spread skilfully upon the cadaverous cheek; he has seen robes of purple thrown over the seedy vest, and, of a verity, it is not strange that he should sometimes laugh in his sleeve while looking at the play. He knows the exact line between the actor and the man, and is conscious that it would be unjust to describe him as the fellow, painted and wigged, with old clothes under the royal mantle; or to describe him as a magnificent monarch, with a heart bold as a lion's, but soft as a woman's.

He who describes to us a character or an occurrence, exactly as we would have seen them had we been present, gives us the best idea of them that can be conveyed by words. The novelist, who describes the scenes, characters and incidents in his story so naturally that it seems as though we are actually stirring in the scenes and taking part in the conversations ourselves, instead of reading in the shade of our own piazza, that novelist, we say, gives us the most perfectly fair idea of life; which is the mark they all profess to aim at. We have before stated that this power, rare and wonderful as it is, is not of itself, in our opinion, enough to entitle an author to a place in the very first rank of novelists. We have never, however, met with one possessed of this power of writing who had not likewise the other requisite for a great writer, viz: a deep and thorough knowledge of mankind. The last is sometimes seen without the first; but the first without the last, never. One possessed of the mental ca-

capacity to study his own nature well, has little difficulty in perceiving, what no other would believe, to wit, that although no two are exactly alike, yet all are so nearly alike, that, when you know one you cannot easily be deceived by another. As the wolf is known by his howl, and the panther by his soft tread and yellow eye, so is every different phase in the nature of man indicated by some outward and visible sign; less obvious, it is true, and often requiring a study of many years to learn, but not less hard of concealment when once learnt. They are, in fact, part of the *res gestæ*, and again we insist that he only can be called a great novelist who teaches human nature, as it is, by showing at the same time how it appears, and what different guises it assumes.

In Mr. Thackeray's books, there is no character whose like we have not seen, and do not see every day. He depicts no far-fetched, no unearthly beautiful, or unearthly hateful men and women. There are no Quilps and no brothers Cheeryble in his pages. We recognize, in the character of every individual he draws, an exact portraiture of man, as we know him ourselves, and not as authors would generally have us know him. They seem to us less like men created by fancy, than like men who live and move and have their being. One proof of our proposition, that, to write in this style is the province of a great genius, is that it is seldom indeed any period of time that has found two such writers living together upon earth. After reading *Vanity Fair*, or *Pendennis*, or even the Great Hoggarty Diamond, how perfectly a book for the amusement of the hour does any novel of Bulwer's seem. And in what a High Dutch phrenzy seemeth Carlyle, with his four-footed superlatives and his jargon about the man-machine and the inner light. Of a verity, they seem to us like professors of chemistry, who show either polished steel blades, or unsmelted ore, as specimens of iron, and who think it inexpedient to let their scholars know that nothing is more rare than to find in nature any substance in a pure state—one not composed of ingredients totally different in their nature, and often diametrically opposed to each other. They seem to us like professors of mineralogy, who only show their students specimens of the diamond and the topaz, or of arsenic and antimony, without saying that they are only found

in limestone, granite and marble, in the proportion of one to almost infinity.

We can take our penknife and lay the point of it on a hair; but when we open both blades of our knife, and attempt to lay the two points on two hairs, or on the same hair, we find that it requires a truer eye and a steadier hand. When we would lift a large box or board, however light, and essay to set it down with its edges exactly on a corresponding rectangle, marked on a floor, we find it next to impossible. So it is with that author who attempts to make his description exactly cover human nature. He can, comparatively, with ease, give us a supposed question or answer, after the exact pattern of reality; but, beyond that, who of them are not a little beyond or a little short of the mark? When, therefore, we meet with one, like Thackeray, who really holds the mirror up to nature, for God's sake, let us all, of Anglo-Saxon blood, step forward, with open hand, and welcome him to the place of honour which is his due. If it be but for the sake of encouragement to a better style of novelists than we are now blessed with, let us not wait for another generation to do honour to the author who left them so true a picture of how the world wagged whilst their fathers managed it.

Dickens has not done this, albeit it is contended by his admirers, that, in after years, he will rank as one of the great writers of England. We freely allow that, until Thackeray came, he was the first novelist of the day; but we as freely deny that he has, or that his friends for him ever had, any right to expect his works to survive him two whole centuries. It is in vain to make answer by referring to the wit, the humour and the pathos with which all his books are replete. These are qualities which mankind, either as writers or speakers, have never been without, and our children will have more of it laid before them than we have, exactly in proportion as they will grow more crowded upon the face of the earth; and, ipso facto, the press will have more work to do. The humour of Dickens, more than that of any man we know of, is a species of humour adapted exclusively to the age in which he lives. It consists, in a great measure, of a broad flood of ridicule, poured forth most lavishly upon the customs, manners and fashions of the day; nor can his

most enthusiastic admirers say that this is not what constitutes the life and spirit of his works. Does not the experience of earth teach us that all these will pass away, and then who can believe that men will continue to read his books? By far the greater part of them will sound like trash, as pages of words always do when the point is lost. By far the greater part of what is understood of them will be called, as in truth it should be now, very penny-a-lineish, and a very decided catering to the fun of the many-headed, after the low comedy style—a thing which other men will be found to do just as well, in a more modern, and therefore more laughable manner. We think he deserves credit, rather for great cleverness than for talent or genius, in most of his pathetic writing. He has no power to touch the feelings, except by descriptions of death and death-beds, and half of them are failures. How easy it is to imagine one of our children's children, a hundred years from now, making such remarks as these, over an old novel which he has found in an old library: "They say that this was a famous writer in his time, and that our ancestors used to devour many editions of his works, as we do those of —— and ——, and as our fathers did those of ——." What a bore the old fellow is, with his half a thousand pages in a volume—pages full of deliberate, old, cut and dried witticisms, in the midst of which he is perpetually bringing in little pathetic passages, that they may both show off by the contrast. It is true he is not altogether devoid of either humour or pathos, but how inferior in them all is he to glorious old Tom Hood, who must have lived about the same time, (wonder if they knew each other) and who is so perfectly devoid of 'tediousness, the limbs and outward flourishes' which make me shudder when I think of reading this old book again." Alas! human nature will be the only thing unchanged then, and those houses which have been built on sand will fall, and no man can tell the time of the fall thereof. Dickens's descriptions of men are caricatures, which, if cleverer, are to the full as much mortal as those in any other manner unjustly drawn and coloured. We do him no injustice when we say that his descriptions of this life remind us of the Irishman's description of a field-piece—a long hole, with brass around it. We like the man as an author, and we solemnly asseverate that we mean not this for a poor piece of covert wit.



We are far from being among those who believe that the present age judges most correctly of its own writers. Some few of Captain Marryatt's best novels will be preserved, in our humble opinion, long after Dickens is forgotten. The descendants of Englishmen will preserve with reverence the manly and vivid pictures of the British ship and the British sailor, as he was when Britain was queen of the ocean.

That author who has gotten his knowledge of life by close and unfaltering study of his own heart, and has made that a touchstone, upon which to test the reality or emptiness of what is done and said before him; that author, we say, if he really be a man of talent, like Mr. Thackeray, can always write from his own storehouse of knowledge, and so doing, he writes like one who cuts with a two-edged sword. Men, in spite of themselves, recognize the force of the truths which come home to them, with ten times the earnestness, if not readiness, with which they are willing to acknowledge that of any burlesque or any sarcasm, however cutting. Thackeray has been, by universal acclaim, called a great satirist, and justly so. He has in no instance either softened or exaggerated the truth, and a consequence of that fact is, that his writing is a deeper and more cutting sarcasm upon the world which the myriad of modern authors would show us, than upon the bona fide old world we live in. He has simply gotten between the nature of man and all the trappings of vanity with which he is covered, as with a garment, and, being there, he has shown us how weak, how small and how contemptible are the motives which suggest nearly all that is done, for good or evil, by mankind. He has shown, as well as any man ever did, how little real happiness can be bestowed by worldly prosperity; and, in truth, no man has ever shown more plainly than he what a brave show is every day made in the eyes of the world, with capital which is very small and pitiful indeed. He has done all this, in a manner a hundred fold more forcible than if he had penned a learned and elaborate volume in support of every proposition which he either directly or indirectly lays down. The truth, when told in regard to things which every day experience has taught us, can never need any argument, either ingenious or palpable, to support it.

It is this, then, that forms the moral greatness of Thack-

eray's writing, and in this lies his great superiority over any and all of his so-called compeers. The bitterest critic cannot deny the truth of any thing in any of his novels, because, by so doing, he would be condemning his reader's own eyesight and sense of hearing. We could forgive any writer for not being able himself to give a true picture of man, as we could forgive any soldier for not being a Condé; but we ourselves, and we trust the generality of our readers, cannot but hold it an unpardonable sin in any man to condemn a great author, when he is himself so dull of comprehension as not to recognize his kind when he meets them on paper.

But, say critics of this class, it is not by detailing the world, in all its nakedness and grossness, that great books are written; on the contrary, it is by painting the happiness of a life spent in the exercise of every virtuous and ennobling principle, and contrasting it, in the reader's mind, with vivid pictures of the certain misery consequent on a yielding to the seductions of vice. They who speak in this manner have never, we apprehend, studied their subject very closely, or it could not have escaped them that this world must be governed, not by any rules of analogy, but by the rules which have been learned from experience. We, for one, believe that a far greater prince would be formed from the study of *Vanity Fair* than of *Le Histoire de Telemaque*. Thackeray is, moreover, scrupulously free from all charge of ever bringing into his pages any seductive descriptions, by which such writers as himself are charged with feeding the flame of immorality always burning in the world. He says what he has to say in a frank and open manner, and never, like so many modern authors, insinuates by hints and inuendoes the *modus operandi* of those excesses committed before his marriage, by "the heavy dragoon, with large desires and small brains," or of the wife's infidelities with her noble lover. Who, that knows anything, can be ignorant that a thousand adult rakes have been formed by the reading of Bulwer's novels, to every ten formed on the model of *Tom Jones*. For the reason, we apprehend, that Fielding describes the rake plainly and simply, as he is; while Bulwer shows his course, or rather, feebly deprecates it, so sentimentally and apologetically, that young men glory in rivalling him, and girls determine to keep their love for him. The vanity inherent in human nature is so great,

that that youth who could voluntarily forego the reputation of being an irresistible Don Juan deserves to have a monument of fine marble erected over him. We know not one very young man, if there be such an one, who would not almost consider it worth a life-time, to have men and women say of him, as he entered the ball-room, that that handsome, bold, generous-looking fellow is the celebrated Mr. So-and-so, who shot young —— last year, etc., etc. We cannot now remember a novel which has not some mention of a duel in it, nor do we remember a novelist who does not always take occasion to deprecate the custom. We believe it would be difficult to find a man of sense who would deny that all their descriptions and homilies on the subject are calculated to have a contrary effect. As the author of *Pendennis* truly observes, people are not ashamed of wickedness in this world, though they are of meanness.

Any reader of this will err, who thinks we are desirous to see Mr. Thackeray acknowledged and honoured as a second Fielding. His characters are as natural, his pictures of life are as true, and his sarcasm is almost as cutting as Fielding's; but in humour he is his inferior—Shakspeare is no more than his equal. Thackeray has more of talent and less of genius. His conceptions are exquisite; but we miss everywhere the cool, brief, powerful touches with which Fielding portrays every character and every incident, and which makes us see him in our mind's eye as ludicrous as Cruikshanks, whilst he is as soft and rich as Titian or Vandyck. Thackeray, in his own mind, has evidently a most vivid conception of all his characters, and he gives them to his readers almost as perfectly as a picture by Hogarth would do. Unlike Fielding, he seems to have more on his mind than he can well express. He seems to us to work with a fear that, some slight touch of the pencil, in an unguarded moment, may mar the perfection of the picture. If so, the world is under infinite obligations to him for the pains he was at—pains, to which we owe some of the most perfect and powerful delineations of character to be found in the literature of any language. When we say that Lord Steyne and Captain Costigan are neither of them unworthy of Shakspeare, we have paid him, perhaps, as high a compliment as ever an author would ask, at greater hands than our own. The star of Byron would never have set,

could he have created either or both of them. In our opinion, Mr. Thackeray is the only great moral writer of fiction in the English language. As fine as Miss Edgeworth's novels are, it cannot be denied that there is always something lacking in their effect. They are written so that the very characters for whom the lessons are intended never take them to themselves. She tells of the weaknesses and meannesses of some people; but not those of mankind, not those of Belinda or Helen. With all her wit and all her genius, she seems at last but to have adopted the old Sunday-school plan of teaching children goodness, by bidding them "look upon this picture, and on this." Nor does she seem to have recollected that there was never yet a child who did not immediately identify himself with the good boy, as a thing of course, instead of pondering over the matter, and being brought to a sense of the shame and sorrow attendant upon evil courses. No one, in reading *Vanity Fair*, can say that any thing in it is exaggerated and overdrawn, or that this, and this, and this, does not apply to the every-day life we are leading. He brings all the earthiness of the human character before our eyes, with a distinctness and an unmistakableness, which would be humiliating, but for our very familiarity with it. It is by these means alone that the great nobleman, the merchant princes, all they who are the lions of society, and who are admired and envied almost into worship, can be stripped of their outward show and bravery, as by the impartial hand of death, and so held up to the view of the humble world, with all their vices and smallnesses naked and bare. Surely, he deserves to be called a great moralist, who can, and really does, show to the lowly millions, whose lives are spent in envious imitation of the happy few, that their own lot is as happy as the lot of those they envy; that there is every whit as much misery in the palace as in the cottage, and infinitely more that is mean and contemptible. No man, in a greater degree than Thackeray, has shown, with a clearness that brings conviction to every bosom, that

"The rank is but the guinea's stamp,  
The man's the gowd for a' that."

Had he drawn his lines a shade stronger, or a shade broader, his book would have degenerated into simply an



interesting, or a humorous work. Had he drawn them a shade lighter, his book would have been one of that sort of novels which remind us (if a book can be compared to a man) of Shakspeare's fop, who shone so brisk, and smelt so sweet, and talked so like a waiting gentlewoman; a style of book which he has himself very happily termed the rose-water style. The prototypes of his characters can at any time be found in the doors and at the corners, both in town and country. Whenever this can with truth be said of a book, that book hath a value like the value of uncounted gold.

It would be great and manifest injustice, to say roundly that Thackeray is the greatest writer of this century. At the same time, it is no more than justice to say that he is so with a single exception. The exception, of course, is in favour of Sir Walter Scott, of whom it may be said, that, if there be another great unknown in the world, it is he who, either as an author or a man, is Scott's equal. Unlike any other novelist, Scott, by nature a poet and an antiquary, besides being the best fellow that ever was born, has taken for his heroes those among our fathers whose names have been handed down to us, linked with great, glorious or singular careers. It has been well said, that no man is a hero to his own valet, and, in the same sense of the word, it may be said that no man was a hero to the great wizard of the North. He had far too much of the poet in him to lay bare all the little tricks, motives and desires of vanity and pride, which Fielding or Thackeray would have told with a glee bordering on malice. At the same time, he had far too much of the antiquary, as well as great man, in him, not to delight in dispelling the stiff and unfamiliar appearances with which the lapse of ages is so apt to envelope the memory of our predecessors, making them somewhat more like the people seen in the dreams of children, than like bona fide sons of the old man, Adam, who eat because they are hungry, and drink because they are dry. It would be strange if he were not the world's favourite, as he is. He has revived, brought to light, and stamped, almost the very reality of the men who lived, and the deeds which were done, during the times when the destiny of the world was so fiercely battled for, by men and deeds. He has made his native kingdom classic ground to the world, and he has, as it were, wrested from the grasp of time, and rendered im-

mortal, the rugged men of old, to whom mankind are under such incalculable obligations, and who had almost sunk into oblivion. God forbid that we should already begin to call our own writers his equals; that time should already begin to justify, with respect to Scott, Shakspeare's bitter remark, that, like a fashionable host, he shakes the parting guest coldly by the hand, whilst he grasps in the corner, with arms outstretched, as if he would fly.

Although Mr. Thackeray has done none of this, that Scott has done, yet can no fair and candid man deny that, apart from the poetry and romance always mingled, in some shape, in the cup of life, and which go far towards the flavouring of it, he has, in all probability, been a much greater benefactor to his kind than gentle Sir Walter, or than any other novelist of this century or the last. He has not, like the author of *Anastasius*, written a bold and great story of the Levant, with truth standing out in every line, and worth all the *Giaours* and *Corsairs* that were ever written. He has not (as who has?) drawn any one picture, so exquisite and so unparalleled as that which *Sterne* drew of my *Uncle Toby*—however hurried our good steel pen may be, or whatever subject it may be on, it hath never yet failed to pause reverentially, for one moment, on writing that name. Some men are loath to believe that *Sterne* was a bad man; but, of a verity, there are others, who could not believe it though they knew it to be true. After all, however, *Captain Shandy* is so perfectly the child of nature, that he can never, though we love him so much, serve as a model for the imitation of his kind, and therefore, we say that, apart from the romance of life, Mr. Thackeray has written things of greater practical value than any other novelist of the last century or of this. He has done more for virtue than any of them; he has, with a pen truthful and sharp, held vice up to derision, and trimmed off the fine feathers which hid its deformity. He deserves infinite credit, for having taken into hand, in the manner he has done, that most dangerous of all characters to the youth of our time—we mean the “regular *Don Giovanni*, by *Jove*.” He has not, like other novelists, described him as simply the idol of his circle, the brave, the handsome, the generous, the beloved of women. He has admitted all this, and even suggested what of it the young reader

might have forgotten, whilst reading, to remember afterwards, when the lesson would otherwise have been useful. But, whilst he has done all this, he has not failed, in a single instance, to show, in colours too truthful to admit of any cavil, how mean, how small and how contemptible such characters generally are. There is no other instance on record, where the brilliant young officer is shot through the heart on the field of battle, and yet, whilst one's sympathies are all aroused in his behalf, one freely owns that he and his class, who are the observed of all observers, are in reality most contemptible puppies.

For all this we say that the world is under deep and lasting obligations to Mr. Thackeray; but, in a tenfold greater degree, it is indebted to him for having been the first to do an act of justice, which it is a disgrace to human nature that the world has grown so old without ever having seen done. He has taken into hand that character whom no novelist had ever yet brought into his pages except to ridicule. We mean the man who is sprung of low origin, who has got into society by no other merit than his money, and has not a very great deal of that; who, so far from being possessed of graceful manners, or eloquent and insinuating powers of conversation, is homely, to external appearance, in everything. Not the bold-looking, Mirabeau-kind of ugly, not the striking kind of ugly, by which women can be fascinated and which they can fall in love with; but the style of homeliness which is awkward, gangling and uninteresting, which has big feet and hands, which is bashful of address and insignificant of appearance. He has, to his eternal honour, shown, which no other novelist has ever done, that this sort of man may have tenfold more of all that is manly, generous and honourable, than those for whose sakes he is so apt to be neglected, by women and men. Neither the characters of Parson Adams or of Dominie Sampson ever had, or were ever intended to have, this effect. It is to Mr. Thackeray that the praise is due, and although this poor piece of justice has been so tardily performed, none the less credit is due to him by whom it was at last done.

---

## ART. IV.—THE RIGHTS OF THE SLAVE STATES.

1. *Speech of the Hon. D. L. Yulee*, of Florida, on the admission of California into the Union. In Senate. August 6th, 1850. Southern Press.
2. *The Anti-Slavery Examined*. The Constitution a pro-slavery compact ; or selections from the Madison papers.
3. *Annual Reports, presented to the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society*, 1848, 1849, 1850.
4. *The Union, Past and Future*. How it works and how to save it. By a citizen of Virginia.
5. *Resolutions, Address and Journal of Proceedings of the Southern Convention*, held at Nashville, June 3d, 1850.

WHATEVER may be the issue, none can misunderstand the profound impression upon the public mind, made by the legislation of the existing Congress, on the subject of the territories, and slavery in the District of Columbia. At the time we write, discussions of the most excited and impassioned character, disturb the quiet of Georgia, Carolina, Mississippi and Alabama. The opinion prevails in these States, that they have suffered a denial of justice from the federal government ; and, in the denial, principles have been declared, which strike at the foundations of political equality in the Union and social security at home. Before the tempest of excitement and passion shall have reached us, we propose to take a retrospect of the past relations of the federal government with slavery, the positions which have been assumed, in reference to it, by the non-slaveholding States, and the duties which rest upon us, who, for weal or wo, are associated with it.

Slavery was mentioned in the draught of the Declaration of Independence. "The clause reprobating the enslaving of inhabitants of Africa was struck out," says Mr. Jefferson, "in compliance to South-Carolina and Georgia, who had never attempted to restrain the importation of slaves, and who, on the contrary, still wished to continue it. Our Northern brethren, also, I believe, felt a little tender under these censures, for though their people have very few slaves themselves, yet they had been pretty considerable carriers of them to others."

On the 12th July, 1776, some articles, to regulate the



confederacy between the ancient colonies, were reported to Congress. One of these provided that the charges of war, and expenses incurred for the common defence, should be borne by the several colonies, in proportion to *population, of every description*, except Indians. Mr. Chase, of Maryland, moved to amend by inserting "*white*". before population. Thus the relation of slaves to the federal government formed a question within the first month of the connection. "Negroes are property," said the members of the South, "and should be dealt with as property; they cannot be distinguished from lands or personalities." "Negroes are persons," replies Mr. John Adams, "and it is of no consequence whether you call them freemen or slaves. In some States the labouring poor is called the one, and in others they bear the other name; but the difference to the State is imaginary. That the condition of the labouring poor in most countries—that of fishermen particularly in the Northern States—is as abject as that of slaves." This difference between the sections was not composed until 1783, at which time it became the subject of *a compromise*. Upon the motion of Mr. Madison, five slaves were rated as three freemen.

In the formation of the federal constitution, the same difference was manifest. The proposition was made, to adopt the settlement of 1783, as fixing the ratio of taxation and representation. The reply of Mr. Gerry instantly was, "that property ought not to enter into the rule of representation. Why, then, should the blacks, who were property in the South, be, in the rule of representation, more than the cattle and horses of the North." The North generally maintained this opinion, inconsistent as it was with the one formerly defended.

Something more than a month after the Convention met, Mr. Madison delivered the following speech, of concentrated wisdom, in which he disclosed the principles which should constitute the corner-stone of the Constitution, and the almost insurmountable embarrassments that were opposed to their attainment.

June 30th, 1787.

Mr. Madison admitted that every *peculiar* interest, whether in any class of citizens, or *any description of States*, ought to be *secured* as far as possible. Wherever there is a *danger of attack*, there ought to be a *constitutional power of defence*. But he contended that

the States were divided into different interests; not by their difference of size, but by other circumstances—the most material of which resulted partly from climate, *but principally from the effects of their having, or not having, slaves.* These two causes concurred in forming the great division of interests in the United States. It did not lie between the large and the small States; *IT LAY BETWEEN THE NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN STATES, and if any defensive power were necessary, it ought to be mutually given to these two interests.* He was so strongly impressed with this important truth, that he had been casting about in his mind for some expedient to answer the purpose. The one which had occurred was, that, instead of proportioning the votes of the States, in both branches, to the respective numbers of inhabitants, computing the slaves in the ratio of five to three, they should be represented in one branch according to the number of free inhabitants only; and in the other, according to the whole number, counting the slaves as free. *By this arrangement, the Southern States would have the advantage in one house and the Northern in the other.* He had been restrained from proposing this expedient by two considerations: one was his unwillingness to urge any diversity of interests, on an occasion when it was but too apt to arise of itself; the other *was the inequality of powers that must be vested in the two branches, and which would destroy the equilibrium of interests.*”

Mr. Madison proposed nothing correspondent to the great and noble conception embodied in this speech. The equality of the States in the Senate was not a Southern measure, nor was it designed to answer the purpose of their protection. For many years, the power of the North was in the Senate. He opposed the measure for the indiscriminate representation of all persons in the House of Representatives. The debates show that the opinion of Mr. Madison, as to the point of division, was not peculiar to him. It became general.

July 2d, 1837.

Mr. Pinckney. There is a real distinction between the Northern and Southern interests. North-Carolina, South-Carolina and Georgia, in their rice and indigo, had a *peculiar* interest, which might be sacrificed.

July 6th, 1787.

Mr. Pinckney thought the blacks ought to stand on an

equality with the whites ; but would agree to the ratio settled by Congress.

July 9th, 1787.

Mr. Patterson. What is the true principle of representation ? It is an expedient, by which an assembly of individuals, chosen by the people, is substituted in place of the inconvenient meeting of the people. If such a meeting of the people was actually to take place, would the slaves vote ? They would not. Why, then, should they be represented ?

Mr. King had always expected that, as the Southern States are the richest, they would not league themselves with the Northern, unless some respect were paid to superior wealth. If the latter expect those *preferential distinctions in commerce, and other advantages*, which they will derive *from the connexion*, they must not expect to receive them without allowing them some advantages in return. Eleven out of thirteen States had agreed to consider slaves in the apportionment of taxation, and taxation and representation ought to go together. The next day Mr. King said he was fully convinced that the question concerning a difference did not lie where it *had hitherto been discussed, between the great and small States : but between the Southern and Eastern*. For this reason, he had been ready to yield something in the proportion of representatives, for the security of the Southern. *He was not averse to giving them a still greater security, but did not see how it could be done.*

The proposition to admit any representation for blacks was at first rejected, by the votes of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and South-Carolina : the two former States rejecting all representation, and the latter claiming a full representation. The debate was further continued, the 12th July, 1787. The commercial views of New-England and the North, insinuated by Mr. King, were more distinctly stated by Gouverneur Morris.

Gen. Pinckney was alarmed by what was said concerning negroes, and now by what was said about taxing exports. Hoped a clause would be inserted into the system, restraining the legislature from taxing exports.

Gen. Davie said it was high time to speak out. He saw that it was meant, by some gentlemen, to deprive the Southern States of any share of representation for their blacks. North-Carolina would never confederate on any

terms that did not rate them at least as three-fifths. If the Eastern States meant, therefore, to exclude them altogether, the business was at an end.

July 14th, 1787.

Mr. Madison. It seemed now to be pretty well understood, *that the real difference of interests lay, not between the large and small, but between the Northern and Southern States. The institution of slavery, and its consequences, formed the line of discrimination.*

July 22d, 1787.

Gen. Pinckney reminded the convention, *that if the committee should fail to insert some security to THE SOUTHERN STATES, against an emancipation of slaves, and taxes on exports, he should be bound, by his duty to his State, to vote against their report.*

Aug. 16th, 1787.

Mr. Mason moved that no tax should be laid on exports. He hoped the Northern States did not mean to deny the Southern this security.

Mr. Gouverneur Morris considered such a proviso inadmissible.

Aug. 22d.

Mr. Gorhen. HE DESIRED IT TO BE REMEMBERED, THAT THE EASTERN STATES HAD NO MOTIVE TO UNION BUT A COMMERCIAL ONE. THEY WERE ABLE TO PROTECT themselves. *They were not afraid of external danger, and did not need the aid of the Southern States.*

We do not know a more instructive study for a Southern citizen than the debates of the convention, in the formation of the federal constitution, on the interests of slavery. They have been collected, in the pamphlet we have placed at the head of our article, for a purpose we shall hereafter explain. Our limits do not authorize but one additional extract, and that is the speech of Gouverneur Morris, in reply to that of Mr. Madison, extracted above.

He said, "the train of business, and the late turn which it had taken, had led him into deep meditation on it, and he would candidly state the result. A distinction had been set up and urged between the Northern and Southern States. He had hitherto considered this doctrine heretical. He still thought the distinction groundless. He sees, however, it is persisted in, and the Southern gentlemen will not be satisfied unless they see the



way open to their gaining a majority in the public councils. The consequence of such a *transfer of power*, from the maritime to the interior and landed interest, will, he foresees, be such an oppression to commerce, that he shall be obliged to vote for the vicious principle of equality, in the second branch, in order to provide some defence for the Northern States against it. If fictitious, let it be dismissed, and let us proceed with due confidence. If it be real, instead of attempting to blend incompatible things, let us at once take a friendly leave of each other. There can be no end of demands for security, if each particular interest is entitled to it. The Eastern States may claim it for their fishery, and for other objects, as the Southern States claim it for their peculiar objects. In this struggle between the two ends of the Union, what part ought the Middle States to take? To join the Eastern States, according to his ideas. If the Southern States get the power in their hands, and be joined, as they will be, by the interior country, they will inevitably bring on a war with Spain, for the Mississippi. He wished to know what security," etc., etc., etc.

The constitution was the result of much compromise. The largest concessions were made by the Southern States. The moving spring of the Northern States was to command the commerce of the country, through the federal government. The Southern delegates foresaw the danger. Col. Mason, in the Virginia convention, said "that for more than three months, eight States out of twelve voted for requiring *two-thirds* of the numbers present, in each house of Congress, to pass commercial and navigation laws. That afterwards it was carried as it now is. There was a great majority for requiring two-thirds of the States in this business, till a compromise took place between the Northern and Southern States. The Northern States agreeing to the temporary importation of slaves, and the Southern States conceding, in return, that navigation and commercial laws should be put on the footing they now stand." We suppose that the frame of the ordinance for the north-western territory, in the part concerning slavery, may have obtained its present form as a part of the same compromise. It was adopted in the same month these concessions occurred, without a division, by the Congress, sitting in Philadelphia. The constitutional clause, in regard to the importation of

slaves, contains a restriction of the importation to the States then in existence. A partial representation of slaves, and the prohibition of taxes on exports, were insisted on by the South. In the beginning of the convention, provisions were made for the maintenance of the relation in the States; but these were finally waived.

The members of the South, in this body, as well as in others since, acted without concert, and, in the details, left the draught of the constitution to their opponents. The most singular omission consists in the grant of the exclusive over the armies and navies of the country to the federal government, and the refusal of the States of all power of alliance, compact, confederation, to issue paper money; and, at the same time, omitted a guarantee to them against the exertions of the power of the federal government. The apprehensions of the convention seem to have been confined to the centrifugal tendencies of the States, and were never directed to the monopolizing and absorbing quality of the central authority. Apparently, the faith of the convention was implicitly given to the creation of its will; or, they might have supposed the cobweb chains of paper constitutions, upon the strong hand of legislation, would prove a delusion and a snare, and they would not stoop to provide them.

"It was observed in the convention," said one of the members, "at an early day, when the necessity of drawing a line between national sovereignty and State independence was insisted on, that, if Aaron's rod could not swallow the rods of the magicians, their rods would swallow his; therefore, they confined themselves in fortifying the national government."

We thus see that broad, and well-defined, and almost irreconcilable divisions existed in the body that first had the charge of federal affairs, and that these divisions grew as the relationships between the federal government, and the States in which slavery existed, became more intimate. In matters of representation and revenue—that is, the arrangements of political power, of commerce and navigation; that is, all intercourse—these divisions were conspicuous.

The discordant opinions were not less obvious in those discussions in which the moral and economical value of the institution came to be considered. The speech of Gouverneur Morris, the statesman of the convention, who

carried there the most distinct and intelligible ideas and the most palpable and not always patriotic ends of all the members of the convention, will show the depth of the hostility that existed in the northern States to this institution.

It is a matter of remark, that to him was committed the task of arranging, composing and adjusting the constitution, after the general principles were settled. He said "He never would concur in upholding domestic slavery. It was a nefarious institution. It was the curse of heaven where it prevailed. Compare the free regions of the Middle States, where a rich and noble cultivation works the happiness and prosperity of the people, with the misery and poverty which overspread the barren wastes of Virginia, Maryland, and other States having slaves. Travel through the whole continent, and you behold the prospect continually varying, with the appearance and disappearance of slavery. The moment you leave the Eastern States, and enter New-York, the effects of the institution become visible. Passing through the Jerseys, and entering Pennsylvania, every criterion of superior improvement witnesses the change. Proceed southwardly, and every step you take, through the great region of slaves, presents a desert, increasing with the increasing population of these wretched beings. Upon what principle is it that slaves shall be computed in the representation? Are they men? Then make them citizens, and let them vote. Are they property? Why, then, is no other property included? The houses in this city are worth more than all the wretched slaves who cover the rice-swamps of South-Carolina. The admission of slaves into the representation, when fairly explained, comes to this, that the inhabitant of Georgia and South-Carolina, who goes to the coast of Africa, tears away his fellow-creatures from their dearest connexions, and dooms them to the most cruel bondage, shall have more votes in a government instituted for protection of the rights of mankind, than the citizen of Pennsylvania or New-Jersey, who views with a laudable horror so nefarious a practice."

The constitution was ratified, after a great struggle. The apprehensions of those who opposed it were silenced by the superior weight and address of its friends and advocates. The amendments were formed rather to secure

personal than State rights, and no effective guarantee for the latter was proposed. In the settlement of the principles of the constitution, the national party was defeated; but, in the adjustment of the details, and in the phraseology employed to convey power, one is constantly reminded that the pen of the convention was wielded by the leading mind of that party, in the convention and the country.

At the first Congress, under the constitution, the ordinance of 1787 was put in operation, in the north-west territory. The whole of the powers of the federal government, to suppress the slave trade, were employed in 1794, and, on the acquisition of the Louisiana territory, it was suppressed there. No other legislative interference was made. Parties were organized in the first ten years of the constitution, and, in the organization, sectional ideas and preferences are clearly distinguishable. In some of the policy of the country, a jealousy of Western growth is visible. We find, however, no distinct expression of these jealousies, as growing out of the interests of slavery, until the acquisition of Louisiana. A portion of the public men of the North approved of the treaty of cession, although opposed to Mr. Jefferson.

Their approval was based, among other grounds, upon the strength the Northern States would receive thereby. Gouverneur Morris, after enumerating the surpassing advantages of Louisiana, for soil, situation and productions, over the remaining Southern States, asks, "What of all this? This will show that Louisiana *must cripple the commerce and culture of the Southern States*, which circumstance will produce a spirit of jealous enmity between the States and their Western rivals. This will show itself in the two Houses of Congress soon after the new country shall be represented. We, on the contrary, so far from being in competition with the planters of Louisiana, are their useful, and, I may say, necessary, commercial agents. *Good management, therefore, on our part, cannot fail to conciliate them.* So that, unless we are wanting to ourselves, this Southern domain, instead of reducing the Northern and Eastern States to be mere cyphers, may render *them arbiters, in other words, rulers of the Union.* In all this, it is supposed *that our constitution should endure*, notwithstanding the attacks of ignorant zeal, the great addition to a country full large enough before, the wealth pouring in, on full tides of commerce.



the corruption of manners, and those incidents of time and chance which give vigour and effect to the spirit of innovation. Whenever the period shall arrive which Providence may have designated for the change of our organization, it may be presumed that force, not argument, will decide on the form to be adopted by those who may then be in political connexion. *But in the probable situations, previous and subsequent to that event, the nerve and industry of the North must prevail over the indolence of the South.*"

We see, in this, antipathy. Under a corresponding feeling, opposition was made to the acquisition of Louisiana. The apprehension that the power of the slaveholding States would be unduly increased, was the only foundation for this feeling.

The admission of Louisiana was declared by Mr. Quincy, of Boston, on the floor of Congress, to be so flagrant a violation of the constitution as to authorize a dissolution of the government, forcibly, if necessary, peaceably, if possible. The *Hartford convention*, for the first time during the existence of the government, introduced the curtailment of slave power into political discussions. One of the demands of that convention was, that no more slave States should be admitted into the Union, and that the compromise, in regard to slave representation, should be removed from the constitution.

During this period of our national history, the controversies which divided the country were essentially the work of politicians, and were directed against politicians and parties. Democratic ideas had not taken so firm a hold of the popular mind; and men regarded, at that time, the public authorities and representatives as responsible for obnoxious policy. One community did not look upon the representatives of another as agents or machines; but as rulers, giving mould and form to the policy of the State. Probably, the fact was, they did so, as it is now the reverse.

We proceed with our history, and refer now to the debates on the restriction sought to be imposed on *Missouri*, when she presented herself for admission to the Union.

Mr. Yulee, in the able speech, the title of which we have placed at the head of this article, has collected the debates on that bill, to show that the balance of power

was present in the minds of the members, and the thought which divided the convention was controlling in their action. We select two extracts, to show this, and one from a speech of Mr. Sergeant, for the constitutional opinion it contains.

Rufus King said, the extension of slavery beyond the old thirteen United States was a violation of the compact. It abridged the political power of the non-slaveholding States. The admission of Louisiana, itself, made a new confederacy or compact; and if the attempt to extend slavery beyond the Mississippi succeeded, the people of the North ought not to submit, for any interest whatever. No interest ought to be put in competition with political power. It was as one of the original parties to the compact, he felt himself bound in honour not to submit.

Mr. Taylor, of New-York, said, The majority may be in your hands—you may have the power to pass such laws; but beware how you use it. Remember by whom and for whom this government was established. “We, the people of the United States,” made it, to secure our liberty and promote our welfare. True, sir, it is not every violation of the constitution that will justify extreme measures. Our Union may be compared to a commercial partnership. Some omissions of duty and acts of unkindness may be forgiven—many errors of judgment may be overlooked and forgotten; but if there be a transgression which, in its very nature, is beyond forgiveness, and requires resistance, it consists in admitting into the concern new and unexpected partners, in such manner as to change the principles of the partnership itself, and destroy the rights of the original owners.”

Mr. Sergeant asks, “Whence can a State free from slavery derive a right to originate or re-establish slavery? It cannot, by force, reduce freemen to the condition of slaves. This no one will undertake to maintain. It cannot draw them from abroad; for Congress have unquestionable power to prohibit importation. Can it receive them from other States of the Union? The supposition imputes to the constitution the greatest weakness, and is wholly inconsistent with the hope entertained by the great men who formed it, that this evil might one day be abolished. I think this channel is stopped, as it ought to be, by the power of Congress to prevent importation and migration. Importation, we all understand to include

slaves brought in from abroad, from any foreign territory, by land or water; we all agree that it is sufficient to comprehend in its interdict every bringing in of slaves from abroad. The term migration is applied to the same description of persons, and, upon the plainest principles of construction, must be understood to be something different from importation. What can it apply to but the passage or transfer of slaves from one State or territory to another?"

These discussions were followed by a truce, in the country, for a series of years, on this subject. There appeared, however, in the discussion of public questions, a strong tendency to division, having for lines the geographical sections of the confederacy. The command of the commerce of the country, by federal legislation, is, and has been, from the beginning, a predominant part of the Northern policy. The legislation in favour of the shipping interests has amounted to the grant of a monopoly. The location of a bank of the United States concentrated commerce and revenue at the point of location; the assumption of State debts enriched Northern capitalists, and, at a later period, taxes levied upon imports, and duties imposed to prevent or curtail importation, founded the manufacturing cities of the North. The people of that section look habitually to federal legislation for a stimulus to their industrial pursuits. Federal expenditures are applied for, and obtained, for their important enterprises. The varying and constantly increasing demands of this nature, many years ago, awakened opposition. Angry collisions arose between the sections, and, in the discussions they originated, slavery constantly appears near the surface of the debates. A wide gulf in the relations of the States, and the policy suitable to them, appeared to divide the opinions of the public men of the two sections. The North attained a great triumph for its opinions, in the discussions with South-Carolina, in 1832 and 1833, by consolidating the Northern people and politicians into a party, maintaining the indivisible, indissoluble, supreme power of the federal government. The contradiction between these ideas of the North, and the federative notions of the Southern States, is as decided as it is on slavery itself, and probably has its root in the different states of society in the two sections. During these years, there were one or more discussions on slavery, in

which the broad dissent in the opinions of the statesmen of the two sections upon the relations of the Federal Government to it, was manifested. These discussions, while they are important links in the historical chain, yet, of themselves, were marked by no consequence. In 1833, the first dawn of a change was exhibited in the social and political ideas of the country. Before this time, slavery was dealt with as a legitimate institution, which, though it did not command the approbation, was held to be entitled to the tolerance of the entire American community. The objections expressed to it were never directed to its overthrow. It was complained of as an element of power—a bond of political union—or, as an unjust institution—but all held to the conclusion that it could not be assailed, in Congress, or elsewhere, except by State authorities. As a moral and religious institution—as to the responsibility of maintaining it, or the consequences of doing so—these questions did not arise.

The British Government, after the suppression of the slave trade by the Parliament, endeavoured to enlist all Christian nations in a league for its overthrow. In this, it succeeded; and, stimulated, thereby, further anti-slavery movements. The same classes who overturned this traffic, followed their success by an assault upon domestic slavery. Concessions were made by the Tory Government of Great Britain, in 1824, to the principles of abolition. The revolution in France, in 1830, led to the elevation of the Liberal party, in England, to power, the adaptation of the Reform Bill and the British Emancipation Act as applicable to the West Indies and Mauritius. This success was powerfully felt through the Northern States. These causes would have given an impulse to the agitation; but domestic causes gave to it a force almost irrepressible, and broke down those barriers of reserve, which comity to States in the same confederacy, and the absence of a direct interest in the question, had created among the Northern people.

An insignificant disturbance among the slaves in one of the counties of Virginia led to the introduction of resolutions, in 1832, for emancipation in that State, and to full discussions upon the nature and value of the institution, in its Legislature. Some of the opinions there expressed were too much in harmony with Northern sentiment not to form the basis of action there. Societies were organ-



ized, embodying the anti-slavery idea, and papers were established to give it circulation. That we may have a distinct notion of what this idea was, and the forms of its development, we furnish the Constitutions of the principal societies. The New-England Anti-Slavery Society was the first. The Constitution is as follows :

“ We, the undersigned, hold that every person, of full age and sane mind, has a right to *immediate* freedom from personal bondage, of whatsoever kind, unless imposed by the sentence of the law for the commission of some crime. We hold that man cannot, consistently with reason, religion, and the eternal and immutable principles of justice, be the property of man. We hold that whoever retains his fellow man in bondage is guilty of a grievous wrong. We hold that a mere difference of complexion is no reason why any man should be deprived of any of his natural rights, or subjected to any political disability. While we advance these opinions as the principles on which we intend to act, we declare that we will not operate on the existing relations of society by other than peaceful and lawful means, and that we will give no countenance to violence or insurrection.”

The Society then provides for its name, etc.

The second article of the Constitution is :

“ The objects of this Society will be to endeavour, by all means sanctioned by law, humanity, and religion, to effect the abolition of slavery in the United States; to improve the character and condition of the free people of colour; to reform and correct public opinion in relation to their rights, and obtain for them equal civil and political rights and privileges with the whites.”

This Society was followed, in 1833, by the establishment of the American Anti-Slavery Society. Its object was declared to be—

“ The entire abolition of Slavery in the United States. While it admits that each State, in which slavery exists, has, by the Constitution of the United States, the exclusive right to legislate in regard to its abolition in that State, it shall aim to convince all our fellow-citizens, by arguments addressed to their understandings and consciences, that slaveholding is a heinous crime in the sight of God; and that the duty, safety, and best interest of all concerned require its *immediate abandonment, without expatriation.* The Society will also endeavour, in a Constitutional way, to influence Congress to put an end to the domestic servitude, and to abolish slavery in all those portions of our common country which come under its

*control, especially in the District of Columbia; and likewise to prevent the extension of it to any State that may hereafter be admitted to the Union."*

It was further declared—

"This Society shall aim to elevate the character and condition of the people of colour, by encouraging their intellectual, moral and religious improvement, and by removing public prejudice; that thus they may show, according to their moral and intellectual worth, an EQUALITY with the whites of civil and religious privileges; but the society will never, in any way, countenance *the oppressed* in vindicating their rights by resorting to physical force."

These leading and prominent Societies constantly denied any Constitutional control over slavery in the States to exist in any authority exterior to them.

In their address of 1835, they say :

"We hold that Congress has no more right to abolish slavery in the Southern States than in the French West India islands. Of course, we desire no national legislation on the subject. We hold that slavery *can only be lawfully abolished by the Legislatures* of the several States in which it prevails, and that the exercise of any other than moral influence, to induce such abolition, is UNCONSTITUTIONAL. We believe that Congress has the same right to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia that the State Governments have within their respective jurisdictions; and that it is their *duty to efface so foul a blot from the national escutcheon*. We believe that American citizens have the right to express and publish their opinions of the constitution and laws and institutions of any and every state and nation, and *we mean never to surrender the liberty of speech, of the press, or of conscience*."

The Anti-Slavery Society of Massachusetts, in an address signed by W. L. Garrison and twenty-three others, puts forth the same disclaimer :

"We are accused of interfering in the domestic concerns of the Southern States. We would ask those who charge this to explain precisely what they mean by interference. If, by interference, be meant any attempt to legislate for the Southern States, or to compel them, by force or intimidation, to emancipate their slaves, we, at once, deny any such pretension. We are utterly opposed to any force on the subject but that of conscience and reason, which are mighty, through God, in the pulling down of strongholds. *We fully acknowledge that no change in the slave laws of the Southern States can be made unless by the Southern Legislatures. Neither Congress nor the Legislatures of the free States have authority to*

*change the condition of a single State in the slave States.* But, if, by interference, be intended the right of freely discussing this subject," etc.

We have been particular in recording this, because we remember when a candidate before the people of the United States, answered to the same effect as the Garrisons, Moys, Tappans, Phillipses, etc., it was supposed that the South could ask for nothing more.

The effect of these societies was, in a short time, visible. Their method of proceeding was, "to organize anti-slavery societies, if possible, in every city, town and village in the land; to send forth agents, to lift up the voice of remonstrance, warning, entreaty and rebuke; to circulate, unsparingly and extensively, anti-slavery tracts and periodicals; to enlist the pulpit and press in the cause of the suffering and dumb; to aim at the purification of the churches from all participation in slavery, and to encourage the labour of freemen, rather than that of slaves, by giving a preference to their productions."

Within two and a half years, these societies had between four and five hundred auxiliaries—fifteen hundred ministers, and some of their conventions were attended by a thousand delegates. The mails were filled with incendiary matter, and the peace of Boston, Philadelphia New-York, and other cities, was seriously disturbed.

We see, in the New-England society, the religious idea, and in the American, that in combination with politics. Under the guidance of these societies, petitions were addressed to Congress for the attainment of the various ends of this enterprize. In Congress, they found a man of great and varied attainments, of fervent eloquence, ardent and unquenchable passions, indomitable courage, and of an elevated position, to maintain their title to a respectful consideration. This was *John Quincy Adams*. It is proper to allow the abolitionists to estimate his services in their cause. They say, "his enduring and distinctive fame will rest upon the labours of his later years, in the representative branch of the national legislature, in behalf of Northern rights, assailed by slaveholding aggression. This has connected his memory with the history of the great struggle for human rights, which, after all, is the only history that makes a permanent and extensive impression on the mind of dispassionate posterity. For

his manly defence of the right of petition, he deserves high honour and perpetual remembrance. Though he did not accept, at least until near his death, the doctrine that slavery should be swept from the *national domain* at Washington, *as a national disgrace, by the nation's hand, still he led the forlorn hope, which carried the entrenchments thrown up for the defence of that slavery against the hands of its assailants, and helped to make this work of his successors possible, and comparatively easy. The state of things in which we now rejoice by which the question of slavery has become the chief, almost the only engrossing topic of public and private discussion, is largely owing to the resolute and unwearied pioneering of Mr. Adams.* He had a true hatred of slavery, which grew stronger and stronger as his life declined. Had he lived yet longer, we believe his last days would have been signalized by more direct attacks on slavery than those which had distinguished his past career."

The peculiar object of Mr. Adams's hate was the clause in the constitution which permits the enumeration of slaves in fixing the ratio of representation. We know of no speech in our language which condenses such bitter and concentrated expressions of hostility and hate, than one of his, on that subject. We have room but for a single paragraph.

"By this process it is that all political power in the States is absorbed and engrossed by the owners of *slaves*, and the overruling policy of the States is shaped to strengthen and consolidate their domination. The legislative, executive and judicial authorities are all in their hands—the preservation, propagation, and perpetuation of the black code of slavery—every law of the legislature becomes a link in the chain of the slave; every executive act a rivet to his hapless fate; every judicial decision a perversion of the human intellect, to the justification of wrong. *Its reciprocal operation upon the government of the nation is, to establish an artificial majority in the slave representation, over that of the free people, in the American Congress, and thereby to make the preservation, propagation and perpetuation of slavery the vital and animating spirit of the national government.*"

These opinions were carried into Congress with him. They occur in reports made to the body of which he was a member, in 1833, and were inculcated in a formal address, circulated, about that time, among his consti-



tuenets. He became, therefore, an appropriate agent for anti-slavery agitation in Congress. From 1834 until 1844 this war lasted. Mr. Calhoun met the difficulty with his characteristic courage, and intrepidity, and forecast. His prophecies of the power and pervading influence of such agitation have been fulfilled. His counsels and admonitions have now to be considered. He admonished the Northern representatives,

*"If we are to be exposed here, in the heart of the Union, to an endless attack on our rights, our character and institutions; if the other States are to stand and look on, without attempting to suppress these attacks, originating within their borders; and finally, if this is to be our fixed and permanent condition, as members of this confederacy, we will then be compelled to turn our eyes on ourselves. Come what will, should it cost every drop of blood and every cent of property, we must defend ourselves; and, if compelled, we would stand justified by all laws, human and divine. If I feel alarm, it is not for ourselves; but for the Union and the institutions of the country, to which I have ever been devotedly attached, however calumniated and slandered. Few have made greater sacrifices to maintain them, and no one is more anxious to perpetuate them, to the latest generation; but they can and ought to be perpetuated only on the condition that they fulfil the great objects for which they were created—THE LIBERTY AND PROTECTION OF THESE STATES."*

The abolitionists made a conquest, in 1835, of Dr. Channing, who, at that time, exercised a commanding sway over the mind of Massachusetts, and, consequently, their conquest extended to that State. They obtained partial triumphs, in their claim of the right to petition, in 1835—afterwards in 1838—and completely, in 1844. With this triumph, we believe, will be associated the triumph of the prayers of the petitioners.

During this Iliad of agitation, the sphere greatly increased. Laws were procured, in several of the States, so contrived as to render the act for the restoration of fugitive slaves nugatory, by the allowance to the fugitive of the habeas corpus writ and trial by jury, to ascertain his status. The political shape of the question became more distinct, and the whig party, at the North, became more or less identified, in all the States, as affiliated with the agitation.

The dogmas of the anti-slavery party, as a political party, were elaborated in the various tracts published by

Dr. Channing. These have been circulated, by hundreds of thousands, over the country, and, to those who are familiar with them, their influence is perceptible in almost every anti-slavery speech or document. The duty of the free States, he says, in regard to slavery, may be classed under two heads :

“ First, these States are bound to construe, with the utmost strictness, all the articles of the constitution, which, in any way, trench on slavery, so that they may do nothing in aid of this institution but what is *undeniably demanded* by that instrument ; and secondly, they are bound to seek earnestly such amendments of the constitution *as will remove this subject wholly from the cognizance of the general government* ; such as will be just, alike to the North and South ; such as will *release* the North from all obligation, whatever, to *support or sanction* slavery, and will insure the South from all attempts by the free States to stir up the slaves. First, the free States are bound to confine all action, in regard to slavery, to the *north-west limits*, which will satisfy the constitution. Under this head, our attention is drawn to the *chief*, and I may say the only express provision relating to this subject. I refer to the clause requiring that a slave, escaping into the free States, shall be delivered up, on the claim of his master. This provision may seem clear ; but the execution of it, in such a manner as to accomplish its end, *and yet prevent the encroachments of slavery on the free States, is not easy*. The provision was designed to give authority to the master to claim the fugitive slave. But, in doing this, *a far higher good than the recovery of a thousand slaves, flying from the South, is put in peril, and that is, the freedom of the coloured population of the North ; and we are bound to insist that this freedom shall be placed beyond peril. This danger is not imaginary*. Kidnapping, in the free States, is one of the evils which has grown out of our connexion with slavery, and it has been carried on with circumstances of great barbarity. Thus slavery has been recruited at the North.”

He discusses the insufficiencies of the law of 1793 for the protection of the free black, and the decision of the Supreme Court, overturning the State laws providing the trial by jury, and then lays down this principle :

“ The grand principle to be laid down is, that it is infinitely more important to preserve a free citizen from being made a slave, than to send back a fugitive slave to his chain. This idea is to rule over and determine all the legislation on the subject. Let the fugitive be delivered up, but by such processes as will prevent a freeman from being delivered up also. For this end, full provision must be

made. On this point, the constitution, AND A STILL HIGHER LAW, that of nature and God, speak the same language, and we must insist that these *high* authorities shall be revered."

After discussing the constitution and the HIGHER LAW, he concludes :

"A trial by jury ought to be granted to the suspected fugitive, as being the most effectual provision for innocence known to our laws."

He proceeds to consider

"The strict construction which should be given to those parts of the constitution under which the general government has been led to *take slavery into its protection, in its intercourse with foreign nations*. This agency is believed to be wholly without warrant ; and it threatens so to extend itself, and to disturb so much our relations with foreign States, that we are bound, not only by considerations of morality, *but of our essential interests, to reduce it within the precise limits of the constitution*. To insist on groundless, *unreasonable* claims, is an unwarrantable abuse of power ; and to put in peril our national peace, by assertion of these, is to violate at once the national charter, and the HIGHER LAW of universal justice and good will. *The grand principle to be adopted by the North is this, that because certain States of this Union see fit to pronounce certain human beings within their territory to be property, foreign nations are not bound to treat these persons as property, when brought within their jurisdiction. Of consequence, the national government has no claim on foreign governments, in regard to slaves carried beyond the limits of the South, in other countries.*

"The sum of these remarks is, that slavery is not to be spoken of as recognized, in any sense whatever, by nations which disclaim it ; that to them it does not exist, as a right, anywhere ; that in their own jurisdiction it cannot exist as a fact ; and from these views it follows, *that no nation, allowing or ordaining slavery within its limits, has a right to demand any recognition of it, in any shape or degree beyond its own borders. To attempt to protect it, or to require protection for it, in the ports of another country, is to set up not merely a groundless, but an iniquitous claim.*"

He enforces these rules, and then proceeds to declare

"That the free States are bound to insist on the abolition of slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia. The right to do so is clear. Slavery, in the District of Columbia, is not Southern slavery. It has no local law. It is the slavery of the United States. It belongs equally to the free and the slaveholding portion of

the country. It is our institution, as truly as if it were in the midst of us. We do not think of the South. We see, within a spot under our jurisdiction, a great wrong, sustained by law. For this law we are responsible. For all its fruits, we must give account. *We owe, then, to God, to conscience, to rectitude, our best efforts for its abolition.*"

Arguments of a similar character are addressed against the slave trade. He then states the changes needful in the constitution :

"The free States should say, calmly but firmly, to the South : We cannot participate in slavery. It is yours, wholly and exclusively. On you, alone, the responsibility rests. You must maintain and defend it by your own arms. As respects slavery, *we are distinct communities*, as truly as in respect to institutions for the support of the poor, or for the education of our children. *Your slavery is no national concern. The nation must know nothing of it, must do nothing in reference to it. We will not touch your slaves, to free or restore them. Our powers, in the State or national governments, shall not be used, to destroy or to uphold your peculiar institutions.* We only ask such modifications of the national character as shall set us free from all obligations to uphold what we condemn."

Here is found the doctrine of NON-INTERVENTION, which some of the shallow and short-sighted politicians, who hold seats in Congress from the South, have discovered to be so useful in covering their surrender of the rights of their constituents. As this is the conclusion to which the Northern mind, in its highest development, has come, and which, alone, can reconcile it to the Union, and as this is the platform, which, we have been lately told, is broad enough to hold every one, we shall not do amiss by presenting distinctly the general grounds for it :

"The necessity for it," Dr. Channing says, "*arises from the fact of the unwillingness of the North to participate in slavery.* The love of the Union has suppressed, as yet, the free utterance of this feeling ; but the restraints of prudence are continually giving way. Slavery will not, much longer, have the floor of the Senate to itself, or rule the House with an iron hand. The open advocates of human rights, *as yet a small, heroic band, will spring up as a host.* Is it not the part of wisdom to put an end to these deadly feuds ? Is the Union to become a name ? Is its chief good, concord, to be given up in despair ? *And must not concord be despaired of, so long as slavery shall enter into the discussions of Congress.*"



He then proceeds to furnish arguments to the Southern States to give its consent :

"The constitution, if not so modified, can render little service to slavery. *In this country, no law, no constitution, can prevail against the moral convictions of the people. There is a feeling, in regard to slavery, spreading rapidly, which cannot be withstood. These are stronger than parchments, statutes, or tribunals. It is not a fanaticism, a fever ; but a calm, moral, religious persuasion—and whatever, in our institutions, opposes this, will be a dead letter.* No violence is needed to annul a law, which the moral feelings of a free community condemn. The South, then, in admitting such changes of the constitution as are proposed, *will make no great sacrifice. Slavery must, at any rate, cease to look Northward for aid. Let it, then, consent to retire within its own bounds. Let it not mix itself with our national affairs. Let the word slavery no longer be named within the walls of Congress. Such is the good now to be sought. The North should be stirred up, with one voice. Petitions, memorials, directed to this end, should be poured in upon Congress, as a flood.*"

We see here the conclusions of one of the most influential writers of the North. A single edition, of 40,000 of his works, has been disposed of in a few months. The objection to his scheme is its utter impracticability. Granting that the Southern people might concede everything to the *delicacy* and *nicety* of *Northern conscience*—and their exceedingly credulous, unreasoning, and infantile generosity, heretofore, might very well justify the proposition to them—they would only place themselves, thereby, at the feet of their conquerors. Another class, quite as potential as that to which Dr. Channing belonged, at the moment he was imploring our benevolent concern for the *scrupulous* consciences of Boston and New-England, were telling the country that they could not wait for amendments to the constitution.

"They saw that, as *abolitionists*, they could not execute the *proslavery commands* of the constitution, and, as *honest men*, they could not *swear to maintain them, with the deliberate purpose of breaking their oaths*. And what they might not do themselves, they clearly could not *appoint others, by their votes, to do for them*. The only political action that lay open to them was to labour, *outside of the constitution*, and not within it, *for its overthrow* ; to convince the people that their form of government was the greatest *enemy* of their safety, their prosperity and *their honour* ; that all their national prosperity and local advantages were in spite, not because of,

their confederate union; and to persuade them, openly and honestly, to *repudiate the compromise by which they had delivered themselves up, bound, in political servitude, to the tender mercies of their natural enemies, and to erect a new government, free from the disturbing and disgraceful element of slavery, in which the experiment of self-government could be fairly tried.*"

The language of the most conspicuous senators, Davis of Massachusetts and Seward of New-York, in the past session of Congress, was, that between freedom and slavery there could be no compromise. We say nothing as to the degradation that such terms of settlement imply. The powers of the general government were given to it for the "common defence and for the general welfare." The government can perform no *passive neutral part* in the concerns of the States or people. It has received powers to fulfil duties. It has assumed obligations to those who have reposed trust and delegated authority. The part of "non-intervention," in reference to a single interest, involves an accumulated and unequal *protection*, to antagonist or rival interests. The sovereign powers conceded to the federal government are essential to the well-being of every State; and, if neutralized or deadened, the State must undergo decay or dissolution. There is no interest that may not require their exercise; and every interest must maintain its vitality, by the calm assurance that they will be roused into action whenever needed for security. If the federal government refuses to carry the claims of the slaveholder, for redress, to a foreign court, the slaveholder must establish a government that will, or become an easy prey to foreign rapacity. If the slaveholder is to have no surrender of his fugitive slave, he must have an army or navy, to guard his frontiers or coasts, and to punish the enemy who harbours his property. If the slaveholder can enjoy no share of the common property of the Union, he must be exempt from taxes and military contributions. *Protection* is the price paid by government for the support of its citizens, and we can conceive of no disgrace more heavy than the denial of this right of protection, with a simultaneous claim for maintenance against the slaveholder.

We believe we have detailed sufficiently the facts, to enable our readers to collect the state of public sentiment in 1844. Opinions had not ripened into convictions in the Northern States; but the tendencies to conviction were

decided. In this condition, the subject of the annexation of Texas was suddenly introduced, and thrown into the fields of party politics. The movement in favour of agitation was sudden, daring and successful. So many strong feelings and close connections were, at the moment, arrayed in its support, that opposition had not the power to organize for its defeat. The measure was carried by a *coup de main*. It was a case of military surprise, and victory over an unconscious adversary. There was but a single cause to justify this brilliant political enterprise, and that was furnished by the letter of Lord Aberdeen to Mr. Everett. Annexation "*was made necessary*," says Mr. Calhoun to Mr. Packenham, "*in order to PRESERVE domestic institutions, placed under the guarantee of their respective constitutions (United States and Texas) and deemed essential to their safety and prosperity.*"

This statement of the case, the only statement which could acquit the United States, furnished to the North the grounds of bitter complaint. We fully appreciated the dissatisfaction of the Northern States, and were solicitous that Southern intercourse and policy, after that event, should disclose great care and deference, in order that those discontents might be soothed. The commanding and considerate statesmanship of Mr. Calhoun, in reference to the Oregon boundary, was admirably adapted for the purpose. Had the same conciliatory policy been pursued towards Mexico, as he maintained for Great Britain, the happiest results might have been expected. It is with infinite satisfaction that we refer to the pages of this review, in 1847, and find that deference to Northern policy, in regard to the acquisition of territory, and the dismemberment of Mexico, recommended. The Southern States owed a tribute to the peace of the Union, and might have gracefully discharged it, by acceding then to the Northern policy of no more territory.

Why the senators from the South permitted the acquisition, without a settlement of the disputed questions of slavery, has never been explained. Why, having the vantage ground that the constitution gave to a minority, in the exercise of the treaty-making power, they should have deliberately abandoned it, has always been incomprehensible to us. We are now defeated, after having yielded advantages of position that made victory certain.

The *Wilmot proviso*, in anticipation of this cession, was

passed, by a unanimous Northern vote, in the House of Representatives, in the summer of 1846; and, had a vote in the Senate been then taken, it would have been unanimous there. In the House of Representatives, in 1847, it was appended to the three million bill, by a vote of 115 to 105. In the Senate, this was struck out, by a majority of 10.

The session of 1847-8 was characterized by the sway of anti-slavery opinions over its proceedings. The questions, of the obligations of government to compensate for slaves employed and lost in its military service; of the abolition of slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia; of the refusal of the use of the courts and jails of the District for fugitives; the abduction of seventy slaves from the District, through abolition influence; the fugitive slave bill, and the Wilmot Proviso—all afforded occasion for anti-slavery discussions. As if these were not sufficient, some congratulatory resolutions, to the French and Italian people, on account of their revolutions, were offered by a free soil member, of Ohio. These were offered to be amended by Mr. Ashmun, as follows: "And we especially see an encouraging earnest of their success, in the decree which pledges the government of France to the *immediate emancipation of slaves* in their colonies." Which amendment Mr. Schenck offered further to amend, by adding, "recognizing, as we do, the great cardinal republican principle, that there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except for crime." The compromise bill of Mr. Clayton, of Delaware, was passed in the Senate, by a vote of 32 to 22, and the Wilmot Proviso excluded, by a vote of 33 to 21. This bill was rejected, in the House, by 112 to 97. The Oregon bill passed the Senate, without any clause in regard to slavery. The proviso was inserted, in the House, by 129 to 71. This was stricken out, in the Senate, by 33 to 21, and the bill, with the Missouri compromise line to the Pacific ocean, passed, by 33 to 21. The House rejected this amendment, every Northern member, except Birdsall, of New-York, Brodhead, C. Brown and J. C. Ingersoll, from Pennsylvania, voting against it. The Senate receded—Benton and Houston joining the Northern States. The following session was distinguished by the continued refusal of the Congress to establish governments for the territories.



We shall now pass to the consideration of the progress made in other quarters, in the promulgation of abolition ideas, and in the accumulation of strength to the anti-slavery cause, so that, when we come to review the measures adopted by Congress, we may fully understand their relations.

During this period, the French provisional government, "considering that slavery is an attempt against the dignity of man; that, by destroying the freedom of man, it suppresses the natural principles of right and duty; that it is a flagrant violation of the republican dogma, of liberty, equality and fraternity; that, unless effective measures follow close by, the proclamation already made, of the principle of abolition, may arise in the colonies, decrees, slavery shall be entirely abolished in all the colonies and possessions of France, at the end of two months after the promulgation of this present decree in each of them. From the promulgation of this present decree in the colonies, all corporal punishment, all sales of non-liberated persons, shall be absolutely interdicted."

Art. 6. The colonies purified from slavery, and the possessions in the Indies shall be represented at the National Assembly.

Slaves, in the Danish colonies, in the West Indies, were liberated by a decree of the 18th September, 1847. All slaves under sixteen years of age were set free, and those over, subject to an apprenticeship of four years. This apprenticeship was abolished in 1848.

The proceedings, in the States of the Union, during this period, indicate the same growth of an anti-slavery spirit. Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Maine, New-Hampshire, Vermont, Pennsylvania, and, we believe, New-York, (the Senate passed the bill, 17 to 5, but we have no notice of further action,) respectively forbade all their officers and people from interfering, in aid of the master to recover his fugitive slave.

These States, with unparalleled unanimity in their legislatures, party conventions, ecclesiastical meetings, and primary assemblies, have affirmed all the claims of the anti-slavery party, and recognized the propriety of the exclusion of the Southern slaveholder, with slave property, from all the territories. They have approved of propositions to remove it from all situations over which the parties had jurisdiction. The great religious associations

have been importuned to interfere with the relation of master and slave, in the Indian country, by their missionaries, and in the States, through the ordinances of the church. The most favourable political opinion given in the Northern States stops at this point, that the government shall not interfere, to exclude or to prohibit it, on the "common ground" of the confederacy; and this opinion is alone made palatable by the assurances given, that existing laws and natural causes forbid the introduction of slaves on that "ground." This vast and controlling body demanded plain and explicit legislation, to prevent the extension of slavery. It was openly and frankly avowed, that the extension of slavery could not be tolerated; that Southern ambition and rapacity must be held under the curb which such a restrictive policy imposed; that there could be no more expansion or growth for it; that slavery had found its boundaries. This did not come from fanatics—from zealots in politics or religion—but was calmly, dispassionately and advisedly spoken, by men of entire responsibility, who were in a position to know, and even to mould, the opinions of their constituents.

A notice of the state of judicial opinion, in reference to these subjects, will close this branch of our subject. The Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Groves vs. Slaughter*, some years ago, determined that a State had the plenary power, of excluding slaves from its borders, and that this right was paramount to any commercial regulation of Congress. The grounds of the decision are well stated by Judge McLean; and an opinion, of transcendent ability and force, of Mr. Justice Greer, delivered in the license cases, 5 Howard, S. C. R., contains a lucid exposition of the principle. The question has not come before the court, of the power of Congress to interfere with the transport of slaves from State to State, for sale, or whether it can prohibit such a transaction. The opinions declared by some of the judges, in the "passenger cases," raise very painful apprehensions on this subject, and appearances already indicate an agitation, to accomplish, in relation to this traffic, what has been done in regard to it for the District of Columbia. Petitions to Congress, to prevent the transmission of slaves from State to State, for sale, and denunciations of the internal slave trade, will now become a staple of anti-slavery agitation.

The Congress which has lately adjourned was elected

under the anti-slavery ideas of the Congress of 1848-9. It was elected for the purpose of excluding slavery from the territories, by means of the Wilmot Proviso.

The administration of General Taylor, to avoid this specific measure, and at the same time, we suppose, to insure the exclusion of slavery, sent to California instructions for the call of a convention, to form a constitution, and to erect the community into a State. Similar orders were sent to New Mexico.

The military commander (General Riley) in California, pursuant to Mexican law, as he says, assumed the functions of the civil executive. In the proclamation furnished to him, he informs the population of California that the Mexican laws retain their authority until repealed. It is important that citizens should understand this fact, he says, "*so as not to endanger their property and involve themselves in useless and expensive litigation, by giving countenance to persons claiming authority which is not given them by law, and by putting faith in laws which can never be recognized by legitimate courts.*" "In virtue of the power in him vested," General Riley appointed a day for the election of delegates to a convention. He appointed the number of delegates, the districts in which they were to be elected, the qualification of the voters, the mode of conducting the election, and concludes with this extraordinary statement: "The method here indicated, to attain what is here desired by all, viz: a more perfect political organization, is deemed the most direct and safe that can be adopted, and one *fully authorized by law. It is the course advised by the President, and by the Secretaries of State, and of War, of the United States*, and is calculated to avoid the innumerable evils which must necessarily result from any attempt *at illegal local legislation.* It is therefore hoped that it will meet the approbation of the people of California, and that all good citizens will unite in carrying it into execution." This impudent effrontery, this deliberate, cold-blooded, brazen usurpation, this infamous perversion of law and fact, has not received from the people of the Southern States the reprobation it deserves. The misdeeds of the cabinet are imperfectly understood. The country has been so well satisfied with their unceremonious dismissal, that it has not sought to inquire into the specification of their offences. Their transaction in California was of such a nature, that we

are rejoiced to find their most prominent and decided supporter was forced to say, were wholly without a precedent. The whole proceeding was an intrigue, of the most disreputable character, and which has been sustained by equivocation and the suppression of truth.

We suppose that this proclamation was prepared by an officer of the cabinet, and that all the arrangements in California were prompted by direct instructions, or artful insinuations, from Washington city. The Senator from Connecticut, (Mr. Smith,) who was supposed to stand in a nearer relation to the cabinet of Gen. Taylor than any other member, was forced to say,

“The Convention which formed the constitution now before us (California) was held without authority of law. It is said there are precedents for California. But this I deny. In all other cases there were organized governments. But not so in California. Society was there in a chaotic state. There was no law, fixing the limits to be represented in convention, laying off those limits into election districts, declaring the time, place, and manner of choosing delegates, establishing the qualifications of electors or the right of suffrage, or determining the time and place of holding the convention. In these respects, the case of California is wholly unprecedented. The convention was little better than a caucus, and the constitution, in point of validity, is mere waste paper.”

Mr. Webster, in his argument in the Supreme Court of the United States, upon the proceedings of Dorr, employs some observations, which are very relevant to this constitution :

“Suffrage,” he says, “is a delegation of political power to some individual. Hence, the right must be guarded against force or fraud. That is one principle. Another is, that the qualification which entitles a man to vote must be prescribed by previous laws, directing how it is to be exercised, and also, that the results shall be certified to some central power, so that the vote may tell. We know of no other principle. If you go beyond these, you go wide of the American track.”

Again, he says :

“All qualifications which persons are required to possess before they can be elected, are, in fact, limitations upon the power of the electors ; and so are rules requiring them to vote only at particular times and places. Our American mode of government does not draw any power from tumultuous assemblages. If any thing is



established in that way, it is deceptive. It is true, that, at the revolution, governments were forcibly destroyed. But what did the people then do? They got together, and took the necessary steps to frame new governments, as they did in England when James II. abdicated. William asked Parliament to assemble, and provide for the case. It was a revolution, not because there was a change in the person of the sovereign, but because there was a hiatus, which must be filled. It has been said, by the opposing counsel, that the people can get together, call themselves so many thousands, and establish whatever government they please. But others have the same right. We have, then, a stormy, South-American liberty, supported by arms to-day, and crushed by arms to-morrow. Our theory places a beautiful face on liberty, and makes it powerful for good, producing no tumults. When it is necessary to ascertain the will of the people, the legislature must provide the means for doing it. The constitution of the United States was established in this way."

The argument employed in Congress to justify these irregularities was a subterfuge. The system of laws left by the Mexican government, and the organization it provided, the proclamation of Gen. Riley informs the population of California, was sufficient for their "temporary wants." Here, then, was a case in which a wide departure had been made from the track, before that time pursued, for the organization of a government over the territories, and attended with circumstances of suspicion, relative to the motives of the transaction. The orders sent to New Mexico were not fulfilled in the manner contemplated, and the case of that territory did not come up for consideration until the end of the session.

The circumstances of their fulfilment—the corresponding with those of California in all the facts of irregularity—were such a ludicrous caricature of the principles we recognize as the pillars of our institutions, that an *abolition* Congress could give no support to them. The failure of New Mexico and Utah to comply with the instructions of the cabinet, left the administration policy, upon the meeting of Congress, in an abortive, unaccomplished condition. It presented itself to Congress, maintaining the monstrous and deformed state of California, and military governments in the territories. The administration had offended its principal Southern supporters, and Mr. Clay was in the Senate, to rule or ruin.

This want of preparation of the administration, the defencelessness of its position, in regard to New Mexico

and Utah, placed its policy at the feet of the discontented, in the party which elevated it to power, and those of the opposing party who desired avengement for their defeat. After many discussions, a committee of thirteen was raised, which produced, after a long incubation, a series of bills, which have been termed "an adjustment." The report of the committee assumed that the *status quo*, in California, New Mexico and Utah, was unfavourable to the admission of slavery—so favourable that no prohibition was needed. The *status quo* being already established, on free soil principles, the committee accepted it.

The dismemberment of Texas, and the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, with an amendment to a bill before the Senate, in regard to the escaping slaves, constitute the features of this report. The dismemberment of Texas was accomplished, by taking one-third of her territory, and imposing upon the common treasury \$10,000,000, to indemnify her. The events of the session indicate that this contract was made, was ratified by the Texas Senators, in advance. The scornful denunciation, by Col. Benton, of the inherent corruption of the bill, hardly received a reply. If there had been a doubt, the ludicrous exhibition, by the ambidextrous representative from that State, must have satisfied the most incredulous mind—an exhibition in which he was not alone. Dr. Chalmers has recorded it, "that the morals of politicians are the morals of horse-jockeys."

We can imagine that border politicians, skilled in Mexican and Indian craft, would not conduct an enterprise upon any known rules of civilized management. Looking over the whole scheme of Texas dismemberment—the declarations of Gen. Cass and others, in 1847, that the claim of Texas to the Rio Grande was an "undoubted one," and their refusal to allow it now; the indifference of the government to the holding of lands, with their profuse appropriation, and the tenacity of their claim here; the course of the Texas delegation; the war message of the President; the fiery indignation and fiery speeches it occasioned; together with the singular movements in Texas; the flagrant tergiversations of members of Congress on the subject—it is one of the most discreditable transactions in American history.

We have adverted to the principle of "*non-intervention*." We have shown that its object was not to secure *South-*

ern rights, but *Northern* consciences. If carried out, it overturns all legal and constitutional barriers against abolition, and submits us to the "*higher law*." That government which fails to secure, fully and impartially, the *legal* rights of its citizens, within the range of its jurisdiction, is unworthy of support. The end of government is to remove the confusion and anarchy that attend uncertainty and misgiving. Confidence in the future is the well-spring of enterprize, and under this principle none can exist. The very object of the principle is to place slavery at the mercy of its enemies, by the abdication of the government of its duties to the slaveholder. His property would then become a prey to rapacity or fanaticism. The truth is, that these bills were framed to suit *free soi!* interests, and to disguise the motive from the eyes of the slaveholder. The Northern supporters of the bills declare that an explicit exclusion of slavery was unnecessary;—and Northern approbation is won to them, by the promise that, whenever such an exclusion becomes necessary, it shall be applied. The abolition of the slave trade in the District of Columbia affords an earnest of the spirit, and discloses the quality of the legislation, which is deemed fitting for such a case. We may therefore conclude that the law of exclusion has been applied, in all the conquests of Mexico, and will be perpetuated by more stringent enactments, whenever the slightest breach in the law is discovered.

There remains, then, the fugitive slave bill, as the compensation to the Southern States for the systematic hostility manifested to the spread of their institutions, and to the convenience of their emigrant population. It is said, in a book before us, "that there has not been an attempt to arrest a fugitive slave, in Massachusetts, for seven years." The papers tell us, that, in the city of Boston, alone, there are near one thousand fugitives.

"The tide which has been flowing for so many years, but especially since the inception of the anti-slavery enterprize," say the abolitionists, "from the South to the North, has continued to pour, in a swelling flood, in spite of the increased vigilance and angry care of the slave-masters. The love of freedom has proved to be, indeed, stronger than the fear of death; and dangers, in the most frightful shapes, have been dared, so that liberty might be achieved. Here, again, we may point with pride to one of the triumphs of the abolitionists. Where one slave made a successful escape, twenty

years ago, probably fifty make good their flight now. In this State, (Massachusetts,) and in others, an attempt at re-capture is unheard of, and none has been made here for more than seven years. The fact seems to have become an established one, that the trouble and expense of reclaiming a slave that has reached one of the New-England States are more than he is worth."

Will the law, then, which has been enacted afford more efficient protection to the master than that which existed from 1793, to the time of abolition interference, without complaint? What has rendered the new law necessary? The force of public opinion arrayed against it.

"A HIGHER LAW than the constitution protests against the act of Congress on this point. According to the law of nations," we quote Dr. Channing, "no greater crime against a human being can be committed than to make him a slave. This is to strike a blow at the very heart and centre of all his rights, as a man—to put him beneath his race. On the ground of the immutable law of nature, our government has pronounced the act of making a man a slave, on the coast of Africa, to be piracy—a capital crime. And shall the same government enact, or sustain a law, which exposes the freeman here to be reduced to slavery—which gives facilities to the unprincipled for accomplishing this mighty wrong? And what is the end for which the freeman is so exposed? It is that a man, flying from an unjust yoke, may be forced back into bondage, an end against which nature and divine justice protests; so that, to confirm and perpetuate one violation of the moral law, another, still greater, is left open and made easy to the kidnapper."

We have no question that the fugitive slave act is destined to as short a life as any legislative measure ever adopted. In fact, so thoroughly was the South impressed with this conviction, that nothing but the manifold and multiplied instances of aggression, and the arrogant and contumelious policy declared, in reference to the territories, ever raised the case of escaping slaves into prominence. The South would have found a remedy for this, apart from Congress, or would have endured it in silence, had the spirit of justice obtained a place in the conduct of the Northern people.

We have thus placed before our readers the facts relative to the anti-slavery agitation, the principles on which it is founded, and the end at which it aims. We feel that we have furnished no adequate idea of its extension, nor of the untiring energy and zeal with which it has been



prosecuted. The pure abolitionists have been the marks of much obloquy. The politician who aids their enterprise, and submits himself as an instrument to accomplish their designs, indulges vituperation and reproach against them. The conduct of that very politician affords the most unequivocal proofs of their influence over the community.

Cut loose, as they are, from civil and ecclesiastical societies—denouncing governments and churches, without restraint, for the slightest toleration of slavery or slaveholders, they hold up to a community, already hostile to the institution, the duty of its overturn, as the single duty of life, in political affairs, worthy of a religious and responsible being. They disdain political or party associations; they refuse all connection with public affairs, in consequence of this damning offence and sin of the constitution—that it recognizes slavery;—they wield over politicians, officers, ministers, citizens, a censorship, of the sternest and most rigorous character. A kind word to the slaveholder is reproved; a conciliatory sentiment to the South is reprimanded; insults and outrages upon the rights of slaveholders are commended. “We are not the model, but the warning of nations,” say they “and this, owing to the disturbing element of slavery, which our fathers introduced, and we suffer to exist, in our national economy. We see plainly that the elimination of this abhorred ingredient must precede any successful attempt to erect a true republic, enduring and flourishing, under the auspices of a pure religion. To do this is the appointed and chosen work of the *abolitionists*. In the presence of such a purpose, the sectarian strifes, the partisan struggles, the social competitions of the hour, dwindle and disappear. Ours is the only movement of this age and country that will impress itself indelibly on the destinies of all coming time. While the ephemeral objects which agitate the contemporary mind must soon pass away and be forgotten, the change which we seek to achieve will influence the condition of millions, as long as the earth shall endure. For such an end, we may well forego the temptations of a vulgar ambition, and cheerfully dedicate the best powers of our mind and the best years of our lives, for the blessings of our labours will never cease from off the earth, and their memory will endure forever.”

If this is called fanaticism or enthusiasm, it is a fanati-

cism or enthusiasm that calls into activity the most powerful and constant of the human passions. It is a feeling which will command a general and pervading sympathy in those quarters where there is not an interest to excite opposition. Their stern and uncompromising spirit may excite antipathies ; but, it is by such a spirit that a community is led. They say, and we see no reason to doubt their conclusion, that their voices "never reached the uttermost parts of the Union so clearly," their opinions and practices have never been so distinctly repeated and proclaimed by the universal press, by the legislatures and by the Congress of the United States, or their philosophy and method been so well understood by the general mind of the country, as since they adopted the principle, "*no union with slaveholders.*"

We pass, now, from this class, to one inferior in morals, but superior in the management of worldly affairs—men who are willing to take oaths they mean to trifle with, and to incur obligations they mean to violate. The class we speak of is that of the political abolitionists. They are "strict constructionists" of the constitution, according to the advice of Dr. Channing—a man who could not have been a politician on his own precepts.

This is the school of "*the higher law*" politicians. It is composed of men who find, in their abstract notions of duty, a repeal of the provisions of the constitution they swear to observe. This class is a large one, forming a majority in the New-England States, the country districts of New-York and Ohio, and wielding a large influence in every Northern State. The principles of this school were declared by Dr. Channing, and are put in operation by Mr. Seward. This gentleman maintains the sovereignty of the Union, and its duty to curtail the limits of slavery, by a prohibition of it in the territories, and abolition in the District of Columbia. He advises the South "*to take hope, and to give hope*, by commencing forthwith, by *all means* in their power, and with *such aid* as Congress *may* give, the work of abolition—to employ ten, twenty, or even fifty years, for its accomplishment."

The next class call themselves "conservatives." They steadily and uncompromisingly oppose the extension of slavery ; rejoice over the admission of California, because it guarantees the power of the free States ; and who omit the Wilmot Proviso, because it was not deemed necessary.

This class declares its purpose to abridge slavery, if its progress appears at all menacing. The most friendly class is that which escapes all responsibility, by declaring that Congress will do nothing in reference to slavery, and who justify themselves for this by assuring the country that the *status quo* is all that can be desired, to accomplish freesoil results.

The acts of the Northern people correspond fully with the policy which every class of its politicians avows. Congress refused, with the unanimous consent of their representatives, propositions to recognize the right of the slaveholder to enter, with his property, on the territories; to remove the obstructions to his emigrating to them, with his property, arising from the supposed existence of Mexican laws; to divide the territories by any line, conceding to the Southern slaveholder a right of free and equal entry; and, with one heart and soul, admitted California, with all the enormities of her history. The doctrine of "non-intervention" was universally deemed, by them, an adequate measure to exclude slavery, in consequence of the *doubt* concerning the force of Mexican laws, (to give it no other name,) and, on this principle, commanded but a small minority of the votes in the non-slaveholding States east of the Ohio.

This survey enables us to complete this article, by a review of the past conduct and future policy of the Southern States. We have complained, that, with the tempest hanging over the issue, and which has burst upon us, the Southern politicians should have given any heed to the wolfish cry, of "indemnity for the past, and security for the future," with which the country was inflamed against Mexico. We deplored the direction of Southern votes, in the ratification of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, without a guarantee that the peace with Mexico, and the acquisition of territory, would not lead to a more embittered warfare upon our institutions. We condemn now, and did at the time of its introduction, the vicious principle of the Clayton compromise. We have shown that this principle came from one of the most scientific architects of abolition. We condemn, now, the votes given in Congress, tolerating that principle, or which lately yielded to the *intrigue* for the dismemberment of Texas. We applaud that heroic band, who, in both houses of

Congress, did *noble* battle, with constancy and perseverance, for the rights of the Southern States to *equality*.

Still, we cannot exclude from our minds the conclusion, that these errors of Southern management, (if they are so,) have only accelerated the march of abolition, and determined the field on which the rival principles of slave and free institutions should have their *decisive* battle. We have fought upon the territories the fight, which could not have been long avoided. It is in the constitution of things, that institutions resting upon conclusions so antagonistic and contradictory as those of the two sections of this confederacy, should be brought into collision. In every civilized community, the moral and religious ideas which are general, constantly seek for universal predominance. They ask for an unrivalled sway. There is an irrepressible tendency, in every community, to arrange its material interests around a uniform, consistent and harmonious system of moral, social and political dogmas. It is this harmony which creates and constitutes a community. All the classes which compose a society, especially where there are no legal or social barriers to hinder it, continually tend to the same standard of intelligence, and to submit to the rule of the same opinions. The decomposition and disturbance of this body of opinion and doctrine, are the parents of anarchy and confusion, and lead to revolution. The revolutionary movements of Europe spring from the decay of the principles of the supremacy and infallibility of the church, the divine authority of monarchies, the legitimacy of orders in the State, and the struggle of the contrary opinions of popular sovereignty and individual freedom, in religious interests, for domination. When the different States of the settled portions of Europe had been reduced to the empire of Rome—when the privileges of the imperial city became accessible to all—when the separations arising from varieties of language, laws and manners had been partially removed, unity and uniformity of worship, in an empire feeling strongly the sway of religious opinions, became necessary. The doctrine of one faith, one hope, one baptism, to combine all the nations of the earth, was a WANT which christianity supplied—nations, kindreds and tongues yielded to it.

This moral law upon us, as we are justified in terming it, was an inevitable fact, to occur in our history. The question was only one of time. The marvellous increase



of the facilities of intercourse, the multiplication of commercial and social ties between the sections, the formation of national parties, and the habits of free discussion, and of irritating controversy they engender, have hastened the current of events. To these powerful and all-sufficient causes, the revolutionary and innovating spirit of the times must be added. There is a distinct European civilization manifesting itself, in the congruity of ideas, opinions, laws, worship, arts and pursuits, in the leading European States. This, we brought to this country, and it has been fed by a constantly increasing immigration from Europe. Whatever strongly agitates the European mind, heaves the bosom of this country in a sympathetic emotion.

We have alluded to the stimulating influences of European excitement, in favour of emancipation, on the same party in this country. Sir Robert Peel, in 1848, appreciates the same fact, in a speech in Parliament :

“There have been mighty convulsions in Europe. Their mighty heavings are already felt on the other side of the Atlantic. Look at Martinique! These are useful lessons, by which Brazil, Cuba and the United States will do well to take timely warning. My belief is, that the events which have just happened in Europe must precipitate the time of the final extinction of this slavery and of the slave trade. I hope the abolition will be effected by timely precautions on the part of governments; but there will be an increasing sympathy with the condition of slavery. But, whether there be wise and providential legislation, on the part of governments, or not, I believe its doom is sealed—that slavery cannot long survive—that it must, at no remote period, be extinguished.”

We confess, therefore, that, though we should have greatly preferred another field for the contest, believing that the Mexican war ought not to have been declared, and that Northern aggrandizement was distinctly and deliberately determined as the issue of it, by those whose turbulent and unruly politics produced it; still, we believe the contest was near at hand, and that the struggle necessarily involved the fate of our institutions.

If our view of these questions is accurate, the inquiries to the Southern States are not reduced to questions of wounded sensibility, contumelious treatment, national indignities and injuries—they go to the foundation of our institutions, and involve the existence of our social fabric.

Our war is not confined to the various factions, religious and political, which have combined with a *hostile* administration, to *intrigue* us out of California, to cover their imbecility or treachery; and to make *freesoil* territories by an equivalent to the Wilmot Proviso, without magnifying Wilmot. Had we conquered a privilege in California, and did the courts maintain our claims in New Mexico and Utah, we should not be relieved from our duties.

The frank, manly and magnanimous assertion of our *equality*, as proposed in the Nashville Convention, to Congress, would have thrown the solution of all the questions involving union upon the North. The strife, there, would have been on the question of "no union with slaveholders." The South would have maintained its integrity, and could have given power to the national party in those States. The refusal of Congress to do this, and the imposition of terms deemed humiliating, by the majority of the Southern people, raise the question here at home, whether submission to dishonour, in favour of *such a union*, is a public duty. The strife becomes internecine and deadly on our domestic hearths. It is the total neglect of this appalling consequence—the overbearing and presumptuous tone maintained by the Southern managers of this "*adjustment*"—the evidence of intrigue and bargain apparent on the floor of Congress—the frequent changes of votes, and the glowing tergiversations of members, that would lead us, if possible, to place a veil over the transactions that attend this crisis in our history.

The recognition of slavery, as an institution of property, in the States, entitled to the same rank, privilege and protection as every other institution of property, would have secured the tranquillity of this section of the Union.

This principle has been disavowed, and the contrary principle is the fundamental and organic law of the government. In our judgment, such a principle involves the utter destruction of the institution. Without any power to defend itself against incessant agitation and assault, the parties to it exposed to constant and untiring reproach and obloquy, the federal government its enemy, it must soon become the object of attack and destruction in the States themselves.

The perils of our situation environ the whole South. The contumely, vituperation and menace which assail slavery, assail an interest common to all of these States.

We have seen, with amazement, attempts to depreciate the influence of this conduct. Some of our politicians treat it as originating in generous outbursts of an exuberant spirit, in favour of liberty, and that we cannot suppress it without a suppression of liberty. We view the matter differently. No system of institutions can endure attacks so regular, systematic and untiring as those now directed against slavery. All institutions rest upon the stable convictions of the people who have adopted them. This attack is designed to uproot these convictions, by unsettling opinion, disturbing enjoyment, invading security, imposing dishonour, odium and degradation, as conditions of their existence in any part of the country. The prodigious power of this movement is properly estimated by the abolitionists, when they say,

"The state of things in which we now rejoice, by which the question of slavery has become the chief, *almost the only engrossing topic, of private and public discussion, is largely owing to the resolute and unwearied pioneering of John Quincy Adams.*"

In our judgment, the abolition of the slave trade and slavery in the District of Columbia, the Missouri and Oregon restrictions, and the dishonest settlement of the questions in regard to the Mexican conquests, are of themselves nothing, compared with the engrossing and pervading evil of anti-slavery agitation.

The acts of Congress are but the surroundings—the wrappings—which encase and envelope the deadly enemy. All the ills we complain of have their stem in this bitter root. Southern institutions and Southern men were rendered despicable and degraded, before the *brand* was placed upon them, in the face of the nation. Southern men had lost the sense of their own dignity, before they could have assisted in the work.

The evil, then, being one that affects the Southern States, their first duty is to combine to meet the common danger. This is the first, most earnest, and crying necessity, in their condition. This union must be found in the sentiment, that every State has the supreme and paramount claim on its citizens, and that a community of ideas, local interests and social institutions, render the Southern States objects of vital concern, one to another. In this community of sentiment and institutions, we must find the sources of our future policy. The Southern States

should band, for their common defence. No act which can weaken or destroy one, but must react injuriously or fatally to all. In pointing to the common danger, we have only to refer to the vehemence with which the notion of an *indissoluble Union* was inculcated by the abolition Senators, Seward and Hale, and those closely allied to them, Winthrop and Davis. We refer to the misplaced and mistimed menaces of the meek pacificators, and, above all, to the message of the President, in reference to Texas—a message characterized by such legal absurdities, that one can hardly believe it was more than a political stratagem, to accomplish a doubtful and desirable result. A war by the federal authorities, upon a State of the Union, would be an anomaly so extraordinary, and attended with consequences so direful, that one must be filled with a supercilious scorn for State sovereignties, indeed, who could maintain the notion of its lawfulness for a moment. Independent nations may settle their disputes by war; but confederates must dissolve their confederacy, before such a result could be legitimate or proper.

A State may dissolve its relation to the Union at its pleasure. Most of the States have declared the inherent and *inalienable* power, of modifying their government, as the fundamental principle of their social compact; and some of the States, in their acts ratifying the federal constitution, plainly and unequivocally asserted and reserved it. The union of twenty willing States, and eleven reluctant or subjugated ones, would be such a commentary upon our principles of self-government, that we question whether Mr. Clay or President Fillmore, could endure the hideous record.

We have seen that a party at the North, and we suppose the number of those who sympathize with the desire make a large party, favours a dissolution of the Union. The experiment of the fugitive slave bill, evinces that they cannot fulfil their duties, under the constitution. We take it for granted, therefore, that secession would involve no perils; but this right should be guarded by *arrangements* for its security or defence, among the Southern States. The answer, that the right may be abused, is no reason why it should not be secured. Bolingbroke employed the same argument, to subvert religion, and Rousseau to overturn society. Every people has the inherent right to mould their institutions for themselves,



and the denial of the power to one is an injury to all. These appear to us positions that all the Southern States might properly occupy, and their union, here, would be a precursor to more extended co-operation, for their mutual defence. We should, however, leave our task unaccomplished, if we did not approach those questions that directly agitate important sections of the South, and are present in the minds of all. We have said that the questions growing out of the legislation of Congress have only precipitated the collision, that was otherwise unavoidable. We have constantly anticipated that, long before the western territories could alter the frame of our government, this issue would arise. We have thought it not unlikely, that new questions and new interests centering there, might have the effect to retard the solution in Congress. The mighty growth of the Northern States, by means of foreign immigration, precludes the indulgence of this thought, with any confidence. The fact, that the disease lies deeper than the symptoms in which it displays itself, commands us to look at the treatment proper, apart from those symptoms. In this light, the questions come : Can the institution of African slavery be managed, under a government like ours, in the existing state of public opinion in the Union ? Would a people, beset with difficulties such as exist in the solution of the questions arising out of this institution, grapple with them, with more success, alone, or in a connection with States of greater power and strength, who are hostile to it ? Would it be better for us to surrender the principle of slavery, and "take hope and give hope—use all of our own resources—and obtain as large a contribution as we may, from the federal government, for its extirpation?"

We should rejoice if these questions could be submitted to a council, composed of the most experienced, considerate, discreet, and disinterested patriots in the Southern States, clothed with full authority to mould the policy that their answer demands. We have expressed our opinion, to the effect that slavery cannot exist in this Union, under the existing state of public opinion, and experiencing from its government assaults of the most inveterate and obstinate character. Within two or three generations back, we have seen a throne, rooted for eight centuries. a church, holding power, and a third of the property of a kingdom, a powerful aristocracy, and the

principles of the Christian religion, together, suffer an overthrow, from efforts hardly more concentrated and powerful than are employed against this institution. Give to the South the command of the federal government—enable it to collect its revenue on the profits of commerce and manufactures at the North—let all the disbursements be made in the South, to nurture slaveholding, and make that the favoured interest—give the territories of the Union exclusively to slaveholders—let her orators, political and clerical, and writers, be constantly employed to depreciate, disparage and disgrace every thing but slavery, and how long would it be before Boston and Providence, Cincinnati and Buffalo, would be open to the slave trade?

Reverse the positions : give *protection*—that is, tax the industry of the slave States—to support the *navigation* and *manufactures* of the North—sustain navy yards and navies, armies and armaments, and let the Northern States be the sources of supply and the points of expenditure of them—seize the public lands for their surplus population, and expose the slaveholder and slavery to contumelious outrage, in their assemblies, of whatever description, at home and abroad. and what must be the inevitable result? Shall we surrender the principle of slavery, and “take hope and give hope,” as Gov. Seward advises? Would this secure peace? We judge from the instructions of experience. Read the masterly speech of Mr. Canning, in 1824, upon Sir F. Buxton’s resolutions. He proposed a preparation of the slave for freedom—conceding the principle of emancipation, when it could be safely done. Read, then, Lord Stanley’s speech, in 1832, disclaiming all responsibility for instant emancipation, and casting it upon the overruling demand of the British people. Fanaticism is short, direct and thorough in its methods. Read the comprehensive and masterly report of the Duc de Broglie, upon French emancipation, in 1843, providing, with infinite pains, to spread its consequences over years of discipline and constraint, and compare it with the following trenchant and terse decree, of a provisional and revolutionary government.

“*French Republic.* Liberty—equality—fraternity. The Provisional Government of the Republic, considering that no French land should any longer bear slaves, decrees, a commission is instituted, under the Provisional Minister of the colonies and the marine, to

prepare, within the shortest delay, the act for the immediate emancipation of the slaves, in all the colonies of the republic. F. Arago."

The act prepared gave two months delay. Our American abolitionists say,

"The provision for a delay of *two months*, before *complete* emancipation, and the allowance of three years for Frenchmen, in *slaveholding countries*, to dispose of their slaves, are indeed to be *regretted*, as *blots* upon so brilliant a page of history."

How did the slaves receive it ?

"Seeing their rights placed almost within their reach, and then told they were not to lay hold of them for *two months*, and especially in view of the great uncertainty as to what two months might bring forth, in the history of the mother country, it is not to be wondered at that *the slaves refused to wait*, or that they threatened to *extort at once*, what they feared might be lost by delay. But, as soon as the proper remedy was applied, by the governors of the islands, and *immediate abolition proclaimed*, all fears were calmed, all signs of violence disappeared, frowns gave place to smiles and tears of joy, and *hostile demonstrations* were replaced by religious processions and public ceremonies of rejoicing."

It will be seen, also, that in the British and Danish islands the term of apprenticeship was reduced, in order to answer the popular demands. The plan of Mr. Clay, for Kentucky, if designed as anything more than an offering to his Northern idols—the plan of fixing a future day, (1860,) after which all slaves born should be free—subject to an apprenticeship of twenty-five years—could have resulted in nothing else than a removal of the slaves further south, or an abortive experiment. We can see why the abolitionists should call him "the great juggler of compromise," for this proposition ; we see they are much better satisfied with those measures he lately proposed in the Senate.

These plans for gradual emancipation can only be enforced by the undivided sentiment and action of the preponderating classes of a community, acting above control, interruption or constraint. These could not be attained in communities organized, and in the condition of public sentiment prevalent on this subject, in this country.

This, then, brings us to the inquiry, can the institution of slavery be maintained, or parted with, in safety to the communities in which it is tolerated, under the existing

union, and the present condition of public sentiment, by any, and what modifications, of the federal constitution? or, would it be better for the Southern States most interested, under a new constitution and a different confederation, to seek their safety and happiness?

It is not our purpose to attempt here an answer to this important inquiry. It has been our wish to bring to the notice of the Southern people the question which most interests them, and to urge them *to take counsel together, for a calm, deliberate, disinterested and honest inquiry concerning it*. There ought not to be party divisions, sectional or local prejudices, or personal contests or antipathies confused with this inquiry. It involves all that we have. The community should rouse itself to its highest point of magnanimity, and come with this spirit to its decision, after mature and careful discussions. A Boston philosopher, addressing one of its societies, in 1844, told it,

“At this moment, the terror of old people, and of vicious people, is lest the union of these States be destroyed—as if the Union had any other real basis than the good pleasure of a majority of the citizens to be united. But the wise and just man will always feel that he stands on his own feet—that he imparts strength to the State, not receives security from it—and that, if all went down, he, and such as he, would quite easily combine, in a new and better constitution.”

We quote this from no design of adopting the sentiment it contains; but simply to invoke the confidence and self-reliance that it implies. It is the cardinal principle in our institutions, that the people are competent to form and *re-form* their constitutions. New conditions have been created in our affairs—conditions never contemplated by the authors of the constitution. These conditions menace our peace and safety. The highest obligations devolve upon us to secure these from all peril. This can be done by a united and concentrated movement of the States most interested.

J. A. C.



## ART. V.—BATTLE OF BUENA VISTA.

1. *The Battle of Buena Vista*, with the Operations of the Army of Occupation, for one month. By JAMES HENRY CARLETON, Capt. First Regiment of Dragoons. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1848.
2. *The War with Mexico*; by R. S. RIPLEY, Brevet Major in the United States Army, First Lieutenant of the Second Regiment of Artillery, etc. In 2 vols. New-York: Harper & Brothers, publishers. 1849.
3. *Campaign Sketches of the War with Mexico*; by Capt. W. S. HENRY, U. S. Army. With engravings. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1847.
4. *The Mexican War*; a history of its origin, and a detailed account of the victories, which terminated in the surrender of the capital, etc.; to which is added the treaty of peace, and valuable tables, etc. By EDWARD D. MANSFIELD, Graduate of the United States Military Academy. New-York: Published by A. S. Barnes & Co. 1850.
5. *Congressional Documents*, 1848–9.

IN a preceding number, the campaign of Gen. Taylor has been traced to the capitulation of Monterey. The limited space allowed us prevented the full discussion of our subject in a single paper, and excluded many minor views and illustrations, relating to the operations and battles that were criticised. Compelled to divide the Mexican career of Taylor into two periods, which, for symmetry and force, should have been included in a single representation, we sought the most natural point of separation, and drew our first conclusion, at the temporary suspension of arms, after the conquest of Monterey. Other reasons conduced to this selection. To that time, Taylor had been our sole commander in Mexico—he had battled entirely, or in a large proportion, with regulars—he had enjoyed the implicit confidence of his government, and had regulated his movements according to his own judgment, and on his own responsibility, with little, if any interference, on the part of his superiors in authority; and, as we have seen, his success was complete, under innumerable adverse circumstances. Subsequently, however, there was a change in all these particulars, except the last. The reliance of his government was somewhat

weakened by the armistice at Monterey—by differing with him on the policy of establishing a defensive line, as urged by Taylor, and advocated by Mr. Calhoun and others—and perhaps, also, by political considerations, since it was then first intimated that Taylor might become a successful candidate for the presidency. Another chief, and of higher rank, was ordered into the field, and, although operating on a different line, (not so directed definitely,\* however,) Taylor was thus subjected to a double supervision, which was, to a degree, exercised; and nearly all his veteran troops were taken from him—those whom he had taught to conquer, against every odds, and between whom and their leader existed that ardent attachment which bound the tenth legion to Cæsar. Yet his advice, here, was partially adopted. On the 15th of October, 1846, he recommended, for a decisive blow on Mexico, through Vera Cruz, 25,000 men,† of which 10,000 should be regulars, when, at that time, he had but 3,000 regulars with his army; and, on the 12th of November, for the reduction of Vera Cruz and the Castle only, he advised 10,000 men,‡ of which 4,000 should be regulars, and promised to hold 3,000 regulars in readiness, to meet the remainder from the States. In thus volunteering to deprive himself of the sure means of victory, and to incur the exposure to disaster and defeat, with inexperienced soldiers, or compelling himself to inactivity and a defensive attitude, he made an offering to patriotism, without a parallel in military history; but it beautifully illustrates the maxim, that “he never errs who sacrifices self,” by placing to his military career the crown of imperishable glory. The after achievement was more important, and certainly more brilliant, than any that preceded it; which may be ascribed to the vaster crisis of his position, and to the higher energy, the superior courage, and the more determined will, that it awakened and developed.

Our topic, therefore, will commence with the resumption of hostilities, in Nov., 1846; and Gen. Taylor's progress will be briefly presented, to the consummation of his splendid victory of Buena Vista. But, before proceeding to its consideration, it is proper that we should allude, how-

\* Letter of Secretary Marcy to General Scott, Nov. 23d. 1836. Ex. Doc. number 60, p. 836.

† Letter General Taylor, Ex. Doc. number 60, p. 351.

‡ Ibid, p. 374.

ever briefly, to some of our authorities. It was designed to do this, before the completion of our original plan; but this completion may be long postponed, possibly never executed, and, as it neither accords with our inclination, nor with our regard for the truth and impartiality of history, to omit all notice of the writers on the war, we will delay it no longer. Of the many who have contributed letters touching the events, or sketches of battles, or campaigns, or full military and political histories of the times, and bearing on our subject, we will, on this occasion, name only four. It has been remarked that, in reading a historical work, it is a desideratum to know the character of the author, his situation in society, his political and domestic relations, and the important circumstances of his life, as capable of furnishing a key to his writings, or a ground of confidence in his statements. We are fortunate in possessing this knowledge of three of our authors—these are all officers of the army, distinguished for merit, as their brevets indicate, and, as they have demonstrated, each competent to give an accurate and perspicuous account of both the campaigns in Mexico. We will take them up in the order of rank.

Captain (now Brevet Major) Henry, in his "Campaign Sketches," has given a narrative of the operations of Taylor's army, to which he was attached, from the landing at Corpus Christi to the battle of Buena Vista. He is not comprehensive in details, nor does he aim at completeness. He omits the discussion of the plans of campaign, and makes little if any scientific criticism, either on plans or battles. His descriptions of the last are clear and correct, and all his facts are reliable. But the especial interest of his volumes consists in presenting, in easy and flowing language, in a diary form, graphic delineations of the country traversed—incidents of the various marches—anecdotes and chit-chat of camp—the manner of death, in battle, of many officers—becoming notices of the author's comrades, and touching eulogiums on his friends, who were slain. Devoid of pretension and malice, and exhibiting often his own lively and joyous disposition, spirited, humorous, pathetic, as the scene required, the work affords very pleasant reading, and is highly creditable to its writer.

Captain (now Brevet Major) Carleton wrote an account of the battle of Buena Vista, including the operations of

the "army of occupation" for one month. We esteem this quite a brilliant performance. It contains some errors and omissions, demanding revision and correction, and a few redundancies, to which the pruning knife could be judiciously applied. Thus perfected, it would present the most full, forcible and finished description of this great battle, and would survive all the partial and more ephemeral—indeed, all the sketches—yet written. The important events are prominently exhibited, in the gorgeous style of a rich imagination, yet generally with correct taste. He participated in the scenes he describes—an important advantage over others—he witnessed what he depicts, with some of the colouring, but more than the truth of poetry, and, impressed with the grandeur of the achievement, he often rises into eloquence. The book is a monument to his ability, beyond any of his deeds in arms—will live when they shall be forgotten, whatever they may be—and is worthy of permanent place in the American library.

Lieutenant (and Brevet Major, also,) Ripley has offered the only complete history yet written of the entire war. He is a younger man, a younger officer, and less familiar with the pen, than the others. The task he assumed was a bold and ambitious one; but indefatigable energy, a characteristic of the man, has accomplished it. We are surprised that he should have entered so fully into the political discussions of the day. But it is more to be wondered at, that he should have adopted with enthusiasm his political creed—right, as we are constrained to say it is,—and have permitted it to bias his judgment upon military operations, and military achievements, when accomplished by leaders professing an antagonist political faith. This is certainly an error on the part of a soldier. Like other citizens, he is entitled to his opinions; and when the State law, wherever his station may be, authorizes, he may vote accordingly. And, on all suitable occasions, he is at liberty, temperately and judiciously, to express his convictions. But it is not his province to be an active partisan, nor is it consistent with his position. He is commissioned for life, and owes subordination to existing power. His superiors in the government are liable to change; not so with himself. The exponents of his principles may continue at the head of affairs but for a brief period; the opponents may attain the ascendancy, and, with too much political ardour, carried away by



strong adherence to the one, and bitter dislike of the other, he may reluctantly and negligently perform what the last might require of him. In a General, it might, in war, lead to disaster and national disgrace; in peace, to endless orders and evasions, and consequent detriment to the public interest. In a junior officer, the proclivity would exist, yet the evil not occur, only through failure of the power and the opportunity. A military writer of a military history—and Napier, whom our author admires, is an excellent example—should deal with politics in general, rather than in detail; without ever descending into minute analyses of political questions, or denunciations of political parties, or sarcasms on political leaders. He should present a clear, accurate and comprehensive narrative of military events, with lucid and applicable professional criticism, and with allusions to State affairs, and such only, as may be essential to a proper understanding of the military operations. But, a military work, vindicating one set of political principles, and one political sect, with *ex parte* earnestness, and correspondingly depreciating their opposites, whatever may be its pretensions, cannot be received as impartial history, and, whatever its literary merit, is not becoming to the dignity of a gallant soldier.

It has been said that Major Ripley did not write the book that bears his name. The army, generally, entertain this opinion, and some have even asserted that he never saw it until published! A member of the military family of a certain distinguished general in the war, it has been said that the chief dictated and arranged, and the subordinate (*aide*) adopted and fathered the history. It is affirmed that the last possessed neither the political experience and knowledge, nor the partisan rancour, exhibited in its pages, nor could he have wielded the controversial pen which defends the administration and depreciates the (supposed) opposition generals. Suspicion has even gone so far as to intimate that two political writers are implicated in its production—one having been a conspicuous member of Mr. Polk's cabinet. From our perusal, we did not derive these impressions, and we regard the criticism as unduly harsh. That the military portion of the book may be mainly attributed to Ripley we have no doubt. The military terms, the tactical phraseology, the quotations from Napier, interspersed through the descriptions of the combats, and elsewhere, and the air o

assumed authority, in giving utterance to oracular military dicta, are certainly Ripley's. A difference, perhaps, in style—more terse, more pointed, and barbed with personal venom, of wider grasp, and more equally sustained—may indicate the work of an older and more interested head, in some, if not all, of the controversial chapters. And, in corroboration, without quoting many pages equally convincing, we refer to the second volume, pp. 222, 363 and 629, in which the writer speaks like one in power, and *almost* assumes the first person. But, without distinguishing the authors, and their several parts, we will regard the book it as a whole, and remark upon it as a truthful and “impartial” history, as professed to be in its preface.

The work is quite well written, and is printed and published in the usually good style of the Harpers. In diction, it is, in places, diffusive and somewhat heavy, and new expressions, such as “adulous,” vol. i., p. 62, are occasionally coined. Here and there, are manifested more of the smartness of special pleading, than of the grave analysis and deliberate judgment of historical writing. Yet there is much vivid and forcible narrative—the combats are depicted with warmth and correctness, and the manner, in general, is direct and perspicuous. The sources of information have been thoroughly ransacked—much industry of research, and much labour of investigation, and an able sifting of documents, are obvious. The Mexican authorities were also attentively examined—their State matters well discussed—their civil and military dissensions, the purposes and policy of their leaders and parties; and the influences exerted on all, by the progress of the war, are strongly presented. And in this respect the book will be highly valuable for future reference, since it is very doubtful if the same data can be again collected. It was scarcely necessary, however, to give the Mexican statements prominence over our own, and least of all was it proper to base upon them censures of our generals, as in vol. i., p. 441, in which blame is cast on Taylor for not acting at Buena Vista as a Mexican officer subsequently said that he might have done with success! The introductory history of Mexico is summary and satisfactory. The account of Kearney's march to Santa Fé—of the conquest of New Mexico—of the civil government erected, with its defence, is well written, temperate, truthful and sufficiently copious. No prejudice is betrayed here; ample justice is done to all

concerned, and the narrative is without redundancies. Were the entire history penned in the same spirit of candour with this chapter, it would be a valuable record of our achievements—a standard authority—and worthy a permanent place in every library. Wool's expedition, destined for Chihuahua, is similarly handled, and merits similar praise. And we will include, likewise, the sketches of naval operations. The recital of events in California is made with great minuteness, and the comments on the difficulties that arose among the American leaders\* are liberal, and, we think, just.

\* Several errors are committed, for one of which Ripley is not blameable, since he adopted the official report of Com. Sloat; but two of them demand of us some notice. A pretty thorough account of this conquest may be found in the Review, of July, 1849, and, to fortify asseverations there, we are constrained to take issue with Ripley and his authorities. He says that Com. Sloat received information at Mazatlan, on 7th June, 1846, that induced him to make a descent on California, and Sloat's letter, of 31st July, 1846, justifies him. To the assertion, we offer the following, in contradiction. On the 31st of May, the Commodore wrote, that he had "received such intelligence as would justify his acting." On th 6th of June, (Cong. Doc., 1st session 30th Cong. Report Senate Com., number 75,) he said that, on reflection, he could not act. and that it was humiliating, etc., because to all the world it appeared "*that we were actually at war on the other (Gulf) coast.*" For this timidity he was afterwards rebuked by Secretary Bancroft. Now, we ask what more could he have learned next day, (the 7th June,) to determine him, than that hostilities existed between the two countries? As stated on the 6th, he was, at all events, going to California. He arrived on the 2d July, and, hearing of Frémont's movements, who had revolutionized the province, presumed they were authorized, and on the 7th he took the town of Monterey. On 6th July he had written to Capt. Montgomery, at San Francisco, that he "preferred being sacrificed for doing too much, rather than too little." (same Document.) Why sacrificed at all, if he received news on 7th June, to justify him, under his orders of 24th of June, 1845? But Frémont clinches the matter, when he deposes thus before the above named committee: "He (Sloat, at Monterey, on Frémont's arrival there, 19th July,) then inquired to know under what instructions I had acted, in taking up arms under the Mexican authorities. I informed him that I had acted on my own responsibility, and without any authority from the government, to justify hostilities. Commodore Sloat appeared greatly disturbed with this information, and gave me distinctly to understand, that, in raising the flag at Monterey, *he had acted upon the faith of our operations in the North.*"

Ripley says, again, that Frémont "*reported to Gen. Kearney, as commanding the forces,*" at Los Angeles, and intimates, on this account, more severe censure for his subsequent disobedience. Now, Frémont did not *report* to Kearney at all. He wrote a private letter, in reply to several notes of the same character. When the convention of Cowenga was sent to Angeles, the bearer, Col. Russell, was directed to ascertain who was in command, and to deliver it accordingly. (Testimony of Col. Russell, Frémont's Court Martial, p. 321.) By the testimony of both Russell and Kearney, pp. 321, 324, the last acknowledged Stockton to be supreme, advised the delivery of the paper to him, and it was done. It was never offered to Kearney. These items are of no great importance, but we cite and refute them to establish truth, and to prove what we had previously written.

Little more may be said in praise of the work. The remainder is composed in a reprehensible spirit of partizanship. The views it offers are altogether one-sided ; the arguments in support are too shallow, to impose either on the student of history or on those who are familiar with the matters in dispute. The ordinary reader, however, of which class the masses consist, is liable to be warped into prejudice, and induced to look with cold admiration on the glorious deeds of some of the greatest soldiers in our annals, and to learn, in the end, to regard those deeds as due, not in any degree, to the high qualities of these chiefs, but to the mere chances of fortune. To aid in dispelling such delusions, and in averting somewhat the ill consequences of such impressions, we will briefly dissect a portion of the book—not to make an exposure of even a large part of its unfair reasoning and false conclusions, but sufficiently so to disclose the *animus* of the author.

An elaborate vindication of the administration is attempted, upon every point that has been brought into controversy. Discredit or error is not allowed, in any instance. The country had pronounced judgment, and Mr. Polk and his minister received liberal commendation, for the generally able discharge of their duties. The conduct of the war was in striking contrast with that of 1812, and the credit was awarded where it was merited. But these officers possessed neither omniscience nor ubiquity ; their judgments were human, and therefore fallible, and, in the management of a foreign war, waged 1500 to 2000 miles from the seat of government, it was not only natural, but inevitable, that blunders should be sometimes committed. That there were such, every candid mind, however inclined to the existing authorities, must acknowledge. For some, there are valid excuses ; for others, depending upon political party aims, rather than purely patriotic impulses and objects, there can be none—and the discriminating writer, honestly endeavouring to establish truth, must censure or condemn, as the case requires.

At p. 250-1, vol. i., Ripley makes a warm defence of the authorities at Washington. At 355, he vindicates the Secretary for issuing an order directly to Gen. Patterson, instead of transmitting it through Taylor, to prepare for an attack on Tampico. He says, the violation of this great principle, can ordinarily “lead to nothing but evil,”



and, in the next breath, remarks, that it was not "very flagrant" in this case. If the military principle is of the prominence he gives it, and we fully concur, any violation, under any circumstances, must inevitably terminate in immediate or remote evil. It strikes at the very root of subordination, and a single exercise of such power, by an authority like the head of the war department, would be a precedent and a sanction for its exercise through all the grades of service, tending to subvert all order and discipline. There is no military rule, perhaps, of greater force, than to preserve "the chain of communication (of orders) which binds the military compact,"\* and it is fortunate that occasions arise at intervals for its practical assertion and general recognition. Gen. Jackson was similarly interfered with, in 1817, (see letter, Nashville, Tenn., April 22d, 1817,) and did not hesitate to resent it in the strongest terms, although at a period of profound peace, when little of the detriment might have accrued which was calculated to affect Taylor, engaged in a foreign war. The principle, however, existed at all times, and its assertion was equally necessary, in peace and war. Taylor protested, in a manly letter, and the Secretary returned some sort of an apology. Yet Ripley justifies it, on grounds quite flimsy to military men, and declares the departure from a fundamental maxim not "very flagrant." But, a soldier himself, we do not regard this as his opinion, and we offer it as one proof of his strong political bias. At p. 503, vol. i., the President is sustained in the most wanton and indefensible of all his acts—the recommendation to create the office of Lieutenant General, with the intimation that Benton was to fill it. The friends of Mr. Polk regarded the measure as ill advised, since a majority of them, we believe, united in rejecting the bill to authorize it. And the good faith of Mr. Polk, as an officer and a man, is seriously implicated. The President and Scott became reconciled in Nov., 1846. They had "many long personal interviews"†—the progress of the war, the plans for its prosecution, including the Vera Cruz expedition, were discussed—mutual confidence appeared to be restored—Scott was unreservedly entrusted with the command in Mexico, and left for the

\* Gen. Jackson's letter, 22d April, 1817.

† Scott's letter, 24th Feb., 1848.

seat of war, with expressions of "fervent gratitude" for the "confidence and kindness" of the President. Yet, Ripley says, Mansfield also and Benton stated it publicly, that this same President, even then, had resolved to supersede Scott in command of the army in the field! The Secretary wrote to Scott, 23d Nov., 1846, "It is not proposed to control your operations by definite and positive instructions. \* \* \* The work is before you, and the means provided are committed to you, in the full confidence that you will use them to the best advantage." This looks very much like yielding entire control to Scott, and must have inspired him with the belief, that he was to command the army to the conquest of peace. And we know that such was his opinion, for, when informed that a Lieutenant General was to be created, (he then at the Brazos,) so impressed was he with the confidence of the President, that he said, "Mr. Polk must appoint *me*." Yet, Ripley says, there is not a trace of the pen to show that the President ever designed that Gen. Scott should do more than capture Vera Cruz and the Castle! And we are compelled by this, and the statements of others, to believe it. Thus Scott was to incur the labour of organizing an army—the hazard of landing on the coast of Mexico, opposite the highway to the capital—endure the drudgery of bombarding, and occupying works incapable of a prolonged resistance, attended with fatigue and comparatively little glory—and, when the vista of true military renown was opened before him, and all his toils were to be amply rewarded, at this moment he was to be superseded and degraded! The General-in-chief of the United States Army—of high military reputation, and of unsurpassed military attainments—to be over-rode by a civilian—a man not "baptized in fire," and eminent only as a politician! This is one of the strongest instances of the predominance of party feeling and party designs, over both justice and patriotism, in the President; and as Ripley, *an educated officer*, defends the measure, we cannot offer a more forcible example of his own party feeling against Scott, nor of his political bias.

We are of those who firmly believe—and all history bears us out—that mere theoretical military knowledge does not constitute, and cannot create, the great commander. The high traits essential to success—to unvaried success, under all circumstances—may be educated and

perfected ; but they are born with the man, and are developed by events. Hannibal had no experience of war, when associated in the chief command in Spain, and had acquired but little when elevated to the supreme control ; and his hatred of Rome induced an evasion or disruption of all treaty stipulations ; yet, for sixteen years, his career was a series of splendid triumphs. Cæsar made his first campaign at 41 years of age, and, from the outset, he was General-in-chief—his first advent into Spain being civil, rather than military, and for the purpose of filling his coffers, rather than extending his military reputation ; and his early affair with the pirates only a daring and chivalrous adventure of—at the moment in exile—a reckless youth. Hampden and Cromwell were great leaders, without theoretic information. Lord Clive and Jackson were extraordinary soldiers, without any military attainment. And Prince Eugene said, “The greatest generals have commonly been those who have been at once raised to command, and introduced to the great operations of war, without being occupied in the petty calculations and manœuvres which employ the time of inferior officers.” We will not say that Col. Benton might not have risen at once to the summit of military renown, by the force of exalted genius ; and, with such belief, *necessity* would have justified the President in giving him supreme command in the war. But while Scott lived, and aspired to new laurels in his profession, we maintain that this necessity did not exist. Scott was no unfledged and untried soldier. His past career guaranteed the accomplishment of brilliant operations. The war of 1812 proved his abilities, and his reputation for courage and skill was at least co-extensive with the country. Not a slur had ever been cast upon his untarnished escutcheon as a great captain.

Ripley exhibits some very decided military prejudices. The tone of his book is adverse to both our generals—Scott and Taylor. Few things achieved by them are heartily approved—indeed, none, we believe, without some grain of qualification. Neither in the operations nor in the combats, has full justice been awarded. These are narrated with general accuracy, and described with fullness and much force. But, in his “observations” and running commentaries, with some judicious remarks,

there is a great deal of depreciating criticism, some sarcasm, and many sneers.

His maxims are carelessly scanned, or, for effect ; parts are quoted to sustain the author's views ; while the whole would, in some instances, have contradicted him, or have modified his conclusions. At p. 95, vol. 1, is a fling at all the generals of the army, for their imbecility, with "hardly an exception." At p. 160 is an illiberal allusion to Gen. Taylor, who, it appears, in his dispatch of 1st Aug., 1846, presented, as a consideration, in his march to Monterey, the question of subsistence, and said, in this respect, it would be somewhat of an "experiment," since he could acquire from the Mexicans themselves no definite information on the subject, and it was utterly impracticable, with his limited means of transportation, to carry supplies in a rapid movement on Saltillo. Ripley designates it as an "experimental expedition," and positively asserts that Taylor urged no other reason for his advance, than to ascertain the subsistence resources of that region. Yet, in a previous letter, (July 2d, 1846,) Taylor speaks of an ulterior object, of no less importance than cutting off the northern provinces of Mexico ; and, some time after, in a letter to Wool, he remarked that he expected to be at Saltillo on the 1st of October. Unjust and uncalled for originally, what will be thought of the repetition of the charge—always with a sneer—at least seven times in the same volume, and when, in p. 161, he actually quotes the passage containing Taylor's ulterior views. At p. 169, he says, "without any definite object, other than to ascertain the capacity of a certain region, in subsistence," etc. At p. 248, "the expedition was treated of as one of experiment upon the agricultural capacity of the valley of the San Juan," etc. At p. 252, "as the whole expedition had been experimental," etc. At p. 315, "had enjoyed two weeks observation upon the agricultural capacity of the country." At p. 355, "information respecting the capacity of the country to support 6000 men, or more, had been the avowed object in marching upon that town." (Monterey.) At p. 503, "Gen. Taylor's plan, which, after his experiment at Monterey." And at p. 313, "and as the General had been unable to extend his views beyond the experimental march to Monterey," etc. Here the word *unable* betrays conclusively the tincture of bitterness



which prompted all the allusions. At p. 355, he is capacious with Taylor on other grounds. Again, at p. 304, in regard to his orders to Wool. At p. 257, harsh concerning the battle of Monterey. At 434, severe on Taylor, and ardent in defence of the administration. He is also unjust respecting Buena Vista, and the preliminary operations, and particularly so in alluding to the withdrawal of troops from Taylor, by Scott.

At p. 155, vol. 1, is a sarcasm on Scott, for his letter to the Secretary of War, in which he speaks of conquering a peace, by "regular, incessant, and forward movements" against the enemy, and these words are quoted, as being ridiculous. We wonder how else Major Ripley would have subdued Mexico, and, as a consequence, have "conquered peace?" How else was it accomplished at last? Two pages previously are slighting remarks. At pp. 11, 12, vol. 2, the same. At p. 82, vol. 2, he blames Scott for the attack and failure of Pillow at Cerro Gordo, and did not see "the necessity of attacking them (the lines) seriously, in front." Yet the ground had been reconnoitered by Pillow himself. Scott relied upon his knowledge, and, at his own desire, we believe, ordered him to the post. The works proved stronger than either general had supposed, although battery no. 1,—which was assailed—or, more properly, the angle between nos. 1 and 2—had been seen in reverse from the opposite side of Plan del Rio, (p. 31, vol. 2.) In the same page, and previously, are strictures on Scott's report, that his order for the battle had been "executed," and some deviations are given. Why not publish the "order," and permit the public judgment on its execution? We regard it as a masterly programme! No other battle had so detailed a sketch in advance, and few, in history, were so exactly executed, according to the design. At p. 87, vol. 2, he censures Scott, in a "however," for taking Quitman along with the army, instead of Pillow, when both were made Major Generals, and there were not, indeed, troops enough for the command of one, the Georgia and other regiments having been sent home. This course, on the part of Scott, was within his discretion, and his motives are his own. The service suffered no injury by the decision. Pillow returned in season for the operations in the valley, and, while absent, had the opportunity, at New-Orleans,

of vindicating himself from the charges of Col. Haskell. At p. 96, the government\* would not intrust Scott with the power to negotiate, because it was "*aware of his character and feelings.*" This is a very grave insinuation. Was Scott partial to the Mexicans? Were his political feelings bitter against the administration? Did he carry party schemes to the head of an invading army? Would he have destroyed his reputation, and have sacrificed his patriotism, by assenting to a treaty that, though momentarily elevating his party, would injure permanently the interest of his country and impair its honour? All this, if anything, may be legitimately inferred, and the hero of Niagara was as far removed from such a "character," and such "feelings," as light is from darkness. The two powers, of war and diplomacy, have often been united. Napoleon, in Italy, is a famous example. The great soldier necessarily possesses many of the high qualities of the statesman. Were this the occasion, and space permitted, the propriety of uniting the powers could be demonstrated. Scott had already acted successfully in both capacities; and, withholding the one, and conferring it upon Chief Clerk Trist, betrayed a design to injure Scott, or a want of confidence in his integrity or ability, deeply wounding to his sensibility as a man, to his pride as a soldier in chief command, and was well calculated to sour him against the existing authority at Washington. At p. 150, Scott's motives—none the best—are divined, for the reconciliation with Trist. And finally, at p. 432, Ripley exults that Scott's name had been dropped, as a candidate for the presidency, in consequence of the proceedings of the celebrated Court of Inquiry! We cannot now discuss this matter, nor can we afford room for other citations of Ripley's prejudices. The 2d volume is replete with disparagement of Scott—all that he did, when present, was suggested to him; all that was done, when he was not on the ground, was the sole work of others! We have, however, exposed enough, we trust, to illustrate the controlling sentiment of the book, and will improve, if need be, other occasions to discuss our differences with the author on other points. In the mean time, we sin-

\* The President and his cabinet are not the *government*; but the term, with that meaning, has crept into all the official correspondence, and we continue it for brevity, as well as for euphony.

cerely recommend to him a critical revision of his work, the suppression of many illiberal passages, the assumption of a more elevated and impartial tone, and an appendix, containing the official papers relating to controverted points. This accomplished, it will do him great credit—it will afford interesting and instructive reading, and become a standard authority in our collections. Did it not possess some decided features of *mérit*, we assure him, even this much time would not have been spared to the consideration of its errors.

The volume, of E. D. Mansfield, “a graduate of the United States Military Academy,” and the last we propose to notice, purports to be a history of the war, but we regard it rather as a general review of the war. It gives the principal events, in order, but enters into no discussions of moment—avoids all details of description, and all analyses of political or military action, and is not very particular about dates. It aims to be just, as far as it goes, and we do not think it unduly partial. The vindication of Gen. Scott, throughout, indicates an ardent friendship or admiration for that officer; yet he is not lauded extravagantly nor improperly, at the expense of others. It is well enough written, without any special claim to commendation, for style or arrangement. The high praise awarded to West Point graduates, both here and in Ripley’s book, does not emanate with grace or delicacy from *élèves* of that institution.\* The services of those gentlemen were too conspicuous to be overlooked by the country—they constituted a majority of the regular officers, and were freely distributed among the volunteer troops—and other writers could have displayed their merits, and the high character and eminent value of that academy, without any sacrifice of modesty or good taste. We are sure that so high a mark could never be omitted or disregarded in any comprehensive and fair representation of our Mexican operations—and none other will be

\* A writer of South-Carolina, signing “Marlborough,” to a series of highly interesting and valuable sketches of the battles and manœuvres in which the Palmetto Regiment was engaged, remarks: “Let others gainsay, but it is our opinion, that the scenes of glory and success, which have so constantly attended our arms in Mexico, are attributable to the admirable *stamina* to be found among the *officers* of the regular army. They are, in the main, the effects of West Point intelligence and West Point discipline!” Such compliments are appreciated, and they have an influence.

generally received or permanently preserved. Claiming the same alma mater, we feel justified in making these remarks, which another, through fear of the charge of invidiousness, however appropriate they may be, would hesitate to offer. The book of Mansfield, as a general guide, giving a succinct account of the operations of the war, is very useful, and the original tables, in the appendix, are highly interesting and valuable.

After this, in a measure, digression, much longer than was anticipated, we turn to the main subject of this paper—the battle of Buena Vista, with a summary notice of the preliminary operations.

The armistice at Monterey was disapproved by the President, and, according to its terms, he sent instructions to Taylor, on the 13th October, that it should cease at once. On the 6th of November, Taylor dispatched an officer, to communicate to Santa Anna the decision of our government. On the 13th of the same month, Worth was directed to occupy Saltillo—Taylor accompanying the column, and it was effected, without resistance, on the 16th. Wool had reached Monclova on the 29th of October, en route for Chihuahua, and, in a letter to Taylor, pertinently inquired what was to be gained by the movement on that place. In reply, he was instructed to abandon the original enterprize, and march his forces to Parras, 70 miles south-west of Saltillo. The expedition was a misdirected one, and proved a failure. Had it been accomplished, the result would not have been at all commensurate with the labour employed, and the suffering and expense incurred, in organizing an army in the interior of Western Texas, and transporting its supplies, and moving the troops, through a desert prairie, on this side the Rio Grande, and a comparatively barren and difficult country beyond. Victoria was taken by our troops, under Quitman, on the 29th of December, and Tampico having been seized by the navy, on the 14th of November, the country, from the Rio Grande and the coast, down to Tampico, westward to the Sierra Madre, was in our possession. And, as Kearney had subdued New Mexico, and Stockton and Frémont had subjugated California, the scheme, as far as contemplated and desirable, of severing from Mexico her northern provinces, was executed. The position of the army, however, is regarded by Ripley and others as having been vicious, and, in a military point of



view, untenable. Under some circumstances, we might concur in the opinion ; but, considering those that actually existed, we cannot hesitate to approve the proceedings of Taylor, and we think substantial reasons may be offered in vindication. Taylor's letter, of the 8th of December, 1846, explains fully his objects, and establishes conclusively the justness of his measures. If it were intended to occupy and maintain a defensive line, it would run from Parras to Tampico. Victoria and Saltillo would be intermediate points, and the latter of greater importance than any, since it covers the only accessible route for artillery, from San Louis through the pass of La Angostura. With a strong garrison, and fortified by works here, the plan would be consummated. As Taylor esteemed the Mexicans not at all formidable, and having little confidence in themselves, without artillery, the other points could be readily held, with moderate forces, supplied with that arm. The Tula passes debouched no great way from Victoria. They were practicable for cavalry and infantry ; but, as Ripley suspects,\* if for artillery also, to secure the line, it would only have been necessary to render this place as strong as that near Saltillo—*certainly* the only dangerous points. Victoria was near the port of Soto la Marina, whence all requisite stores could be drawn. Parras was in a productive region, affording supplies and guarding the right flank. Tampico, near the Gulf coast, was equally important, for similar reasons, on our left. The objection, therefore, of spreading the troops over a line of "600 miles," would have been obviated, and likewise, that of the equidistance of all the parts from San Louis, by which, it is true, in an *open* country, the enemy could have attacked and overwhelmed our detachments in detail. Now, early in January, Taylor had ample forces at Victoria to hold that place and the adjacent defiles. At Saltillo, including Wool's command, he had more than he carried into action on the 23d of February, with which he resisted the army of Santa Anna. But had Wool continued at Parras, there were other reinforcements, intended by Taylor (see letter of the 8th of December,) for Saltillo, and as Wool per-

\* Lieut. Meade had examined some of these passes, and found them impracticable. Henry's "Sketches," vol. 2d, p. 290. And Capt. Limard, escorted by May's dragoons, had reconnoitered others, with like result.

formed the march between the places in less than two days, (his cavalry and artillery 40 miles a day,) he was within striking distance, in case of alarm. For a defensive line, Taylor's plan was consequently wise, and in every way calculated to effect his purposes. Additionally, his reserves were posted at Monterey, nearest the Angostura pass, which he regarded the only dangerous point of the line. On the contrary, if, instead of defence, it were designed to advance on San Louis, his operations were equally judicious, since it was necessary to cover all the country that was essential to the security of his army and of his line of communication. It is really hypercriticism to denounce these arrangements; it is like advancing certain rules of war that are entirely inapplicable to the case, and reminds us of the charge against General Scott, in 1836, that he introduced all the parade and the grand evolutions of European armies, in his operations against the Seminole Indians, and about as reasonably advanced, in this instance, as would have been such operations.

The President, however, determined upon a different policy. He would not desist from all effort, on occupying a section, not vital, of the enemy's country—he aimed not at a quasi-peace, liable to be broken monthly, and requiring large expenditure, without adequate, or indeed, any return, for hostilities would not have ceased; but he demanded a firm treaty, negotiated and fixed by legitimate governmental authorities, and, to procure it, resorted to other, and more vigorous and compulsory measures, than a defensive line.

Several events occurred, about this period, which entirely deranged Taylor's contemplated schemes. One was an alarm at Saltillo, on the 19th of December. Worth was there with 1200 men (fewer effectives) and 8 guns. The enemy, within the town, conceived the conquest of them easy, and the governor of the state (province?) expressed his hopes, in a dispatch to the Mexican commander, whose cavalry was within 60 miles, requested an attack on us, and promised the co-operation of the citizens of the place, numbering in population from 15 to 20,000.\* The courier—one at least—was captured, and his papers sent to Worth, who, apprehending a serious movement

\* Henry, vol. 2d, p. 245.

against his small command, called for reinforcements. Wool marched his forces, with praiseworthy expedition, to Worth's assistance. Twiggs' division, on the march to Victoria, was recalled, and returned to Monterey. Butler, with two regiments of volunteers, advanced rapidly from the last place, and the 2d Kentucky regiment made a creditable march, from Camargo to Monterey. With this concentration of troops, the alarm was dispelled. As a consequence, however, Parras was definitely abandoned, and Wool was retained in the vicinity of Saltillo. Taylor, in the mean time, retraced his way towards Victoria. Other occurrences were, that Gen. Scott arrived at the Brazos on the 28th of December, began his preparations for the descent on Vera Cruz, made a requisition on Taylor for nearly all his regular, and a large portion of his volunteer troops, and advised him to fall back on Monterey and assume the defensive. In a letter to Scott, of the 4th of January, 1847, the Secretary of War made a similar recommendation. Worth, under orders from Scott, of the 3d January, received through Butler, marched his division from Saltillo on the 9th. It numbered, by his own report, including those to be attached en route, in the aggregate, 2,666. Twiggs' division, of 1,465, followed, the next day, by 3,268 volunteers under Patterson, moved from Victoria for Tampico, on the 14th. Ripley makes, at this point, another of his unfair allusions to Taylor, vol. 1, p. 340. Opposed to the propriety of occupying Victoria, he remarks that Taylor was forced, by the "state of his supplies," to evacuate the "newly occupied town." The fact is as given, but there was a reason for it, which a candid historian would have offered; but, not desiring to do justice, it was withheld, since we will not suppose him ignorant. Taylor had concentrated at Victoria, on the 4th of January, and, learning from Scott's letter, of the 25th November, from New-York, received 24th of December, that a portion of his troops were to be taken from him, he suspended his operations, in a good degree, and awaited farther instructions. He was thus in statu until the 14th of January, when Scott's orders of the 3d arrived. On that day his troops moved for Tampico, an excellent position for Scott's designs. The "state of supplies" was an element in this decision, because he looked daily for an order to divide his army, and, accordingly, had neither continued arrangements for the defensive line,

nor established his dépôt, of provisions, etc., at Soto la Marina, as previously contemplated. It is plain that he could not have acted more judiciously, and, indeed, any different course might have proved unwise.

Other troops joined Scott, from the Rio Grande, and Taylor was left with 1000 regulars,\* and a volunteer force of some 6000 men, partly new levies, to protect his extensive line, threatened by Santa Anna and 20,000 or more men in front.

Ripley sneers at the complaint, made by Taylor to Scott, for this large withdrawal of force, and charges inconsistency, because the former said, subsequently—the 27th of January, at Monterey—that the troops “left him in that quarter would doubtless enable him to hold the positions then occupied.” And he gives the noble old soldier no credit whatever for his previous offer, spontaneously made, to place a large portion of the army at Scott’s command, for the coast expedition. The truth is, he objected at last, less to the deprivation of force, than to the number of his veterans taken, and the manner of the act—having been kept in ignorance of the plans of the government, and deeming it preposterous, as intimated in the letter of 25th of November, (Ex. Doc. number 60, p. 373,) that he should be expected to take the offensive, in the month of March, with his impaired and diminished army. And is it strange that, at the first view—when almost in despair at his position, and speaking heroically of carrying “out, in good faith, the views of the government, though he may be sacrificed in the effort,” and feeling that he had lost its confidence—that he should fear the inadequacy of his means to maintain himself? And when, a fortnight later, he had looked around—acquired new resolution—conceived that Santa Anna and the main body of the enemy would move against Scott rather than himself—and perceived that he was only expected to defend his line as far as Monterey, is it very absurd, that, like an undaunted soldier, as he was, he should express

\* Taylor’s letter to Scott, January 15th, 1847. Ex. Doc. number 60, page 863. We will say, of this document, that it is most vilely compiled. Scarcely half a dozen letters ever occur successively, according to dates. To search for those required, through a disarray of 1277 pages, demands as much time, and much more patience, than to have written them all. Scott, in his letter of the 3d of January, supposes that Taylor would still have 2000 regulars—an error to be attributed to the want of returns.



the *hope* that he could hold his ground? Instead of blame, we would accord to him high praise. And we want terms to convey our admiration, at the grand effort of self-control, which prompted and qualified his letter to Scott, of the 15th January, when he learned the full extent of the reduction of his forces. Napoleon threw up his commission in Italy for a less cause! Away with the denunciatory opinions, based upon a bitter prejudice, that fancies "no good can come out of Nazareth!"

Taylor evacuated Victoria, restricted his line to the river, and, from Camargo, via Monterey, to Saltillo, and, on the 24th of January, established his head quarters at Monterey. He disregarded the *advice* of Scott and the Secretary of War, to abandon Saltillo, for the following reasons, given in his letter of the 7th of February, 1847: "Not to speak of the pernicious moral effect, upon volunteer troops, of falling back from points which we have gained, there are powerful military reasons for occupying this extreme of the pass rather than the other. The scarcity of water and supplies, for a long distance in front, compels the enemy either to risk an engagement in the field, or hold himself aloof from us; while, if we fall back on Monterey, he could establish himself strongly at Saltillo, and be in position to annoy more effectually our flanks and communications." It may be added, that, holding the Angostura, through which, alone, artillery could move towards the Rio Grande, the line of communication was comparatively secure. And also, if defeated in this position, there were almost impregnable passes to fall back on, in the retreat to Monterey, where the struggle, with reinforcements from the rear, might be again and again renewed; and the enemy would be kept longer engaged in the north, while Scott would more surely find an open highway to the capital.

News arrived, on the 30th of January, that Majors Borland and Gaines' command, of 70 aggregate, had been captured by the enemy's cavalry, at Encarnacion, 55 miles south of Saltillo, on the 20th, while reconnoitering; and also, that Capt. Hardy and 17 men had been taken by rancheros, in the same direction, on the 27th. Taylor the next day hastened from Monterey to his advanced posts, and, on the 5th of February, fixed his head quarters at Aqua Nueva, beyond the pass of Angostura or Buena Vista, and 18 miles south of Saltillo. By the 14th, hi

forces were assembled in that quarter, and he was rapidly procuring ample supplies for his army. Yet, even at that date, notwithstanding the capture of his parties indicated the presence of the enemy in considerable force, Taylor did not anticipate an advance, on their part, and was anticipating (see official letter) the arrival of new regiments, to enable him to make a diversion, to favour Scott. It was not until the 21st that he was confident there would be an attack upon him, and he ordered up Gen. Marshall's\* troops, including Capt. Prentiss' battery of eighteen pounders, from the Rinconada.

The question, whether Santa Anna should have marched against Scott or Taylor, has been a good deal discussed, and we will offer our views in this place. On the 13th of January, Lieut. Richey, while bearing Scott's letter of the 3d, among others, from Monterey, to Taylor, at Victoria, was lassoed and murdered at Villa Gran. His papers, including this requisition for troops, and the plan of the descent on Vera Cruz, were seized, and conveyed promptly to Santa Anna, at San Louis. The enemy thus became early acquainted with our designs, and Scott fully expected to be met by him, in great force, at Vera Cruz; while, as late as the 14th of February, Taylor did not contemplate a battle near Saltillo. Both Generals were deceived; and both our historians (Ripley and Mansfield) argue that they should have penetrated the intentions of Santa Anna—in other words, that the latter acted with wisdom in the course he pursued. With due deference, we disagree to their conclusion, and concur in the justness of the conceptions of our Generals—not only as the circumstances then appeared to them, but judging also after the event. And, while our limits do not permit a full survey, with illustrations, of the points at issue, we will yet offer concisely a few considerations, which are conclusive to our mind.

1. Santa Anna, at San Louis, was about equi-distant from Saltillo, Vera Cruz and Mexico. He commanded over 20,000 men—including Minon and Urrea, nearer 30,000—leaving 5 or 6,000 in observation of Taylor, he could have reached Vera Cruz by the middle of February, and, on the way, have recruited as many more. Having

\* These troops arrived early on the 24th, and were in readiness for Santa Anna, had he renewed the battle on that day.

40,000 troops, or even fewer, he could have easily supplied and strengthened both city and castle, and, in all probability, have repulsed Worth and his 5,000 men, when they landed on the beach.

2. Scott had the larger American army, and aimed to reduce Vera Cruz—the high road to the capital would be open to him, as a consequence—the conquest of the city of Mexico would destroy the *morale* of the people and soldiery, and the subjugation of the country must inevitably follow. It was Santa Anna's first duty to protect the more vital interest, to insure safety to the capital, and meet the invader at the coast, rather than move the flower of the Mexican army in the opposite direction, and attack in a remote and comparatively insignificant province.

3. The *morale* of the Mexicans would have been greatly more elevated by defeating at Vera Cruz than Saltillo, for obvious reasons—it would have been known and felt immediately in the richest and most populous parts of the State—the *fact* would have been indisputable, because the scene was near enough for it to be *known* absolutely—and the grand army would have been crippled and driven to sea.

4. If Santa Anna had money and supplies to march against Taylor, the same would have enabled him to operate, to the same distance, against Scott, and, arriving among a wealthier population, near his own home, and nearer the capital, where Congress, in December, had been unanimous for the continuance of war, he could largely have increased both.

5. Had Santa Anna forced back Taylor, it would not have been a Plassey overthrow—the latter would have rallied at the Rinconada, again at Monterey, where the siege would have been protracted, or better fortune have raised it, by a victory. Santa Anna could not neglect and pass it by. New regiments would have been on the line, in season to aid in defence against detachments, and the movement would have failed of important results; while Scott would have encountered little resistance in his march to the capital.

6. A few thousand troops, to manœuvre in front of Taylor, were sufficient. The route to San Louis was full of difficulties—the water tanks were already destroyed—and the knowledge of Taylor's diminished command

should have induced the belief that no advance was contemplated on his part.

7. Santa Anna did no reason from the past. Arista, in his chosen position, with odds of 4 to 1, and having fine troops, too, was disastrously defeated. He knew, through his spies at Saltillo, that Taylor's force was *about* in the same proportion—knew the Angostura, where he might be met to advantage—from sad experience with the Texans, should have known that he could not *annihilate* Taylor, and therefore, could not promptly control his communications, and threaten an advance to the Rio Grande—and *he should have calculated the effect, to his country, of the failure of his operation.*

The Mexican historians, after the event, it is true, but with knowledge of Santa Anna's means and designs, denounce his course without qualification. At p. 111, they say, "Considering these things, under this point of view, the battle of the Angostura was for us the *loss of the capital*, and would also have been, even if a *victory* had been the result of that action. Its importance to the Americans was great, and would have been great, whatever had been its issue."

Even up to the 20th of February, there was no certain knowledge of the approach of Santa Anna; but, on that day, Col. May, with 400 men and 2 guns, was sent to La Hedionda, to reconnoitre the valley around Potosi hacienda, at which, it was supposed that Minon and his 2000 cavalry were posted, and ascertain if the enemy were advancing through the Palomas pass, which debouched to the north of Saltillo. And Major McCulloch, with his Texan spies, was ordered, on similar duty, to Encarnacion. May saw none of the enemy, but a Mexican informed him, at night, that Santa Anna was moving from the latter place, to attack Taylor on the following day. To be in at the fight, May marched all night, with great celerity, making 60 miles in less than 21 hours, and at dawn communicated his intelligence to Taylor. McCulloch returned the same morning, and confirmed its truth, excepting the probability of Santa Anna's\* having marched forward. Both these officers conducted their commands with consummate prudence and skill.

\* Col. Jefferson Davis, in his speech of 5th of August, 1850, in the Senate, says, that the movement to Buena Vista was determined upon, and commenced before the return of McCulloch.



It was determined immediately to withdraw from Aqua Nueva, and take position near the hacienda of Buena Vista. The former place offered the advantage of receiving the enemy, after a long march, without water; but this was more than counterbalanced by the possibility of its being turned, by either flank, and our communication intercepted. The face of the pass, near Buena Vista, presented serious obstacles to the efficient action of the Mexican cavalry and artillery—his favourite arms—and enclosed between mountains, was highly favourable to the resistance of a small to a large force. Accordingly, on the same day, our army retired there and encamped.\* The stores remaining were guarded, and to be removed as promptly as practicable, by Yell and his regiment, with orders to burn the hacienda and all within, in case there was danger of being cut off. His picquets were fired on the same night. He set fire to the buildings, dispatched his wagons at great speed, saw the stores destroyed, (those not carried to the rear,) and proceeded to the main body, near the Angostura. Santa Anna had anticipated a surprise. Disappointed in this, he construed our retirement into a precipitate retreat, and, without permitting his troops to recover from the fatigue of a forced march, or even to satisfy their thirst, pressed forward eagerly, with the full expectation of cutting us to pieces. He thus rushed, by elated hopes, into the Thermopylæ, from which, had he desired, he could not withdraw honourably, without risking a battle. Minon moved, the same day, (22d,) through the pass of Palomas Adentro, opening near Saltillo, to the east of which he posted his 2000 cavalry, to obstruct our retreat, after being forced. 1000 rancheros, armed with long knives, were stationed on the west of the road, to aid in the butchery; and Urrea, with his brigade, had traversed the defiles of Tula, and was in the vicinity of Monterey. Taylor had hastened to Saltillo, on the 21st, to place it in a proper state of defence, and the command was left with Wool. The glorious 22d of February, the birth-day of the illustrious Washington, broke upon the hostile array. Under a national air, and amid the high inspiration, to the army, of the day and the occasion, Wool advanced the troops to the field of combat.

\* Except Hardin's Illinois regiment, which halted at La Angostura, one mile and a half south of Buena Vista.

With the aid of Inspector Churchill, an estimable officer, and perhaps under general directions from Taylor, they were arranged in order of battle. Before these dispositions were completed, the Mexicans made their appearance—halted beyond the range of our fire—perceived our resolution to face the music of war—and prepared at once for the conflict. Taylor, learning their arrival—without finishing his preparations at Saltillo—returned to meet the greater danger. He approved the positions of the troops—received Santa Anna's audacious summons, to surrender *at discretion*, only allowed because "his particular esteem was deserved"—and returned the celebrated answer, brief, simple, modest, yet calm with undaunted resolution, and firm as the base of the Sierra Madre.

The scene of the mighty struggle which followed lies at a point of the pass a mile and a half south of Buena Vista, and near seven miles from Saltillo. This pass, varying in width from one and a half to four miles, and just here about three miles across, extended from Saltillo to La Encantada, some 12 or 14 miles. The stream flowing between these places was, at this point, nearly equidistant from the mountains, rising 2 or 3000 feet, on either hand, and the road ran not far from its border. La Angostura, "the Narrows," is formed by a high bluff, the jutting extremity of the spur of the mountain, on one side, and the stream, with steep banks, on the other, which restricted the pass to the width of an ordinary highway. Our right flank was protected by a net-work of gullies, washed by the stream, over 20 feet deep, with precipitous sides, which extended nearly to the mountain, and was deemed impassable, certainly by artillery, if not for all arms. After a movement of observation on their part, which was checked, the enemy made no attempts over this lower level, and the battle ground, greatly to our advantage, was limited to the eastern level, a mile and a half across, and about sixty feet higher. There were several spurs of the mountain on this side, running down to the road, with intervening ravines, difficult of passage. The principal one, terminating in a narrow ridge at Angostura, difficult of ascent there, and commanding the road for a good distance, widened, towards its base, in a south-eastern direction, into a plateau—the plateau—some four hundred yards across, nearest the road, and two hundred at the mountain. This plateau was broken, or

scalloped, as you proceeded south, by three gorges, opening upon the road, and increasing in length as you advanced. Beyond, were a ridge, and another broad ravine or valley, the head of which could be turned—and still another succeeded. In the rear, there was one extending to the mountain, behind which were two others, successively, with numerous minor branches. These constitute the striking features of the field,\* and may enable the reader to derive a tolerable idea of the battle, from a general description.

Taylor's force consisted of, aggregate,† 3,406 volunteer infantry, including 368 Mississippi riflemen: 809 volunteer cavalry, and 209 U. S. dragoons, in all, 1018 cavalry, and 16 field pieces of artillery, Washington's horse battery, 8 guns, Sherman's and Bragg's, each 4 guns, and 267 officers and men to work them! Total, 4691,‡ without a single regular infantry soldier, and with an aggregate of regular troops, of 476!

Santa Anna's army was composed of 17,600 infantry, artillerymen, etc.—4338 cavalry, excluding Minon's 2000 cavalry, at Saltillo, and his 1000 rancheros butchers—and 20 guns, ranging from 8 to 24 pounders. Total, 21,338, and, simply to be mentioned, 3000 seven miles in our rear. The Mexican historians, calculated by their translator, place the number at 20,553, including the 23 GENERALS§—which the bearer of Santa Anna's summons impressed upon those who received him—and 39 guns.

\* There was some discussion about the claimants to the selection of this field. Butler, Wool, and Capt. Hughes, T. E., each (or through friends) preferred their right to the honour. At length, however, the weight of evidence confers it upon Wool. But it is of little consequence. Taylor *approved it*, if he did not know of it before the crisis arrived. He determined to hold Saltillo—it was natural to choose, having the time, that position, at or in the vicinity of the town, upon which the enemy could be received to most advantage, and we imagine that no military eye would have glanced over the ground, without perceiving its strong points, and other advantages for battle. Yet, if any special credit is due to General Wool, let it be fully rendered.

† Aggregate—the word includes officers. It is technical.

‡ Henry says 4,425 men and 334 officers—total, 4,759. Ripley says, 4,425 bayonets and sabres, and 15 light guns. He, perhaps, excludes the 6 pounder captured at Monterey, attached to Washington's company, and lost by O'Brien. Mansfield, who is always general, says about 5,000 men. All are near the mark. We have chosen Carleton's statement, who had equal access to all the returns, and seems exceedingly careful in his figures. Yet, in none of the reports have we seen a return of the Texas mounted company, which, on the 23d, took post to the right, and in rear of Steen's dragoons.

§ Carleton.

Washington's battery was stationed at La Angostura, which was our extreme right, on the 23d. Hardin's regiment supported it—a portion behind a parapet, on the tongue of land above, and the remainder entrenched near the guns. It was also supported by McKee's Kentuckians, in the crest of a knoll in the rear. Bissell was on the plateau, with his 2d Illinois regiment, and an associated company of Texan foot. At the base of the mountain, the farther side of the plateau, was posted the volunteer cavalry. The other troops were in reserve, on a ridge in rear of that which Hardin occupied. Santa Anna's forces were drawn up in two lines of infantry, with batteries on their flanks, the cavalry behind them, and the general park in rear, guarded by lancers, and posted on a ridge in our front, with a higher one intervening. His first aim was to occupy the slope of the mountain, ascending from the plateau, on our left, and, for the purpose, dispatched Ampudia, with his four battalions of light infantry. Perceiving the design, Taylor directed a portion of the cavalry to dismount, and, reinforced by some Indiana troops, all armed with rifles, and commanded by Marshall, to ascend the opposite slope (a gorge between) and resist them. O'Brien, with 3 pieces from Washington's battery, sustained by Bowles' regiment, was ordered in support. A shell, thrown from a Mexican howitzer, announced, at 3 P. M., the commencement of the combat. Ampudia and Marshall begun, and continued their sharp-shooting and efforts to out-flank each other, until dark, with trifling loss on our side, (4 wounded) but a good deal of slaughter from our marksmen—300 killed and wounded. With this skirmishing, and an occasional cannonade at our troops on the plateau, precluded by the distance from a reply, ended the affair of that day. An apparent intention of Santa Anna looking to our right also, induced Taylor to send Bragg and McKee's regiment to an elevated ground in the rear of the net-work of gullies, where they passed the night. Feeling sure the enemy would postpone his grand attack until morning, the General went again to Saltillo for the night, in order to complete his arrangements there for security.

On the 23d our dispositions were slightly altered. Washington remained as before. Ampudia having been strengthened by 2000 infantry, a battalion of riflemen (Illinois and Texas) was ordered to join Marshall, still on the moun-



tain side. Bissell was on the plateau, opposite the head of the second gorge, with a gun on each flank—Steen's squadron to the right and rear of them—and McCulloch's mounted Texans to their right and rear. Bowles' 2d, and O'Brien's 3 pieces, on the left of the plateau—Lane's 3d on the knoll behind Washington—while the volunteer cavalry was in the ravine near the plateau, and near the mountain. The others were where the previous night had found them.

The Mexicans were formed in three columns of attack: the first, under Villamel, to carry La Angostura; the second, under Lombardini, to skirt the mountain and force our left; the third, under Pacheco, to pass up the third gorge, and unite with the second in its object; Ampudia was to clear the mountain, and join the others, for a combined assault *in reverse*, or upon our *rear*. The three first were accompanied by strong bodies of cavalry. The 12 pounders and howitzer were placed on an eminence, in front of "the Narrows," to aid Villamel; the 8 pounders were on a ridge near the mountain, beyond the broad ravine, having a plunging fire on the plateau. Ortega commanded the powerful reserve.

At the earliest dawn, the mountain forces began their work, and briskly kept it up. Our main body quietly awaited the onset of the formidable columns. On they came, marching as on parade, in beautiful array, and with admirable precision, proving their instruction and their discipline. Pacheco, having fewer obstacles of ground, was in advance. Bowles' regiment and O'Brien's guns were beyond the third gorge, to meet him. The pieces were vigorously served, and, without intermission, vomited forth their destructive hail. To avoid the enfilade of the 8 pounder battery, he now facing the road, General Lane\* ordered him, with the infantry support, still farther forward, and again he poured his iron missiles (two canisters at a charge) into the serried masses of the foe. Bowles† misunderstood the order, and directed his men to "*cease firing, and retreat*," which they did with all speed, fleeing from the field. O'Brien obeyed Lane, but the enemy continued to advance—their prostrated platoons were re-

\* There were a General and a Colonel Lane on the field.

† Bowles was a brave man—he fought the rest of the day with a musket. A court acquitted him of cowardice, but not of *dullness*. Paymaster Dix gallantly rallied some of his men.

placed—their numbers were overwhelming—while our artillerists, momentarily thinned, were too few to resist them. When almost at his muzzles, O'Brien, much crippled in force, retired with two guns, and left to the enemy the third, without *an unwounded man or horse* to manage it! Nor, on reaching support, were his others in better plight. During this conflict of 25 minutes, Villamil, with his 4000 choice troops, marched upon La Angostura; but a few rounds from Washington's splendid battery broke the head of their column, and drove the entire mass headlong into the broad ravine, for security, and checked, for that day, any repetition of the attempt upon that point.

Pacheco reached the plateau and united with Lombardini—passing near four companies of Arkansans, they too fled the field. His cavalry, pursuing Bowles' Indiana regiment, moved near the base of the mountain, and excited in our riflemen there the fear of being cut off, and they, together with the volunteer cavalry, retreated. Pressed by the enemy's cavalry, and Ampudia, who descended the slope, great loss was sustained, and the Texas company\* was nearly destroyed. The masses on the plateau now maintained their position, against the guns of Sherman, Bragg, Thomas, Garnett and O'Brien, who had exchanged with Washington his two pieces, and promptly appeared again upon the scene. The artillery was formed across the plateau, at the head of the first gorge, and, supported by Hardin, M'Kee and Bissell, sent a storm of iron and lead against the enemy, who replied with unyielding obstinacy.

At this crisis, our left forced and turned, and the retiring tide moving upon Buena Vista, and our centre opposed by tremendous odds, Taylor returned from Saltillo, (11 A.M.) and assumed a conspicuous place on the plateau, between the north ravine and the head of the first gorge. At this fearful moment, he was advised to fall back—to concentrate and occupy new ground—that "all was lost." But the courage of the indomitable chieftain rose with the occasion. Seeing at a glance the condition of affairs, he replied, "No, WE WILL DECIDE THE BATTLE HERE!" His humanity, too, shrank from the butchery of his comrades, strown over the field, and he said also, "I WILL NEVER, ALIVE, LEAVE MY WOUNDED

\* A Texas Lieutenant offered his sword in surrender—it was seized and plunged into him.

BEHIND !" Cheers greeted his arrival—new spirit was imparted to the troops—confidence was re-awakened by the presence of that brave heart, which had never known defeat, and which scorned a "surrender"—and victory was again anticipated, with sanguine hope.

Davis\* saw Ampudia's command, strengthened by cavalry, moving down the second ridge, behind the plateau, elated with conquest, and, asking Wool for Lane's regiment in support, he turned from the road, with his 368 riflemen, to check their progress. Advancing to a minor branch of the ravine, on his right, he hurled a volley into the enemy and staggered him, his cavalry being forced for shelter into the neighbouring ravine. Not satisfied with the distance, he dashed across the branch, met Ampudia face to face, and, without aid, put his infantry to flight, in a disorganized and confused multitude. Seeking the cavalry under cover, a few of whom had crossed to charge in reverse, never to return, they fled. Returning along the ridge, to his first position, Davis was joined by Lane and Kilburn's gun, and, forming again in line, awaited events.

Torrejon's† brigade of horse, pursuing the retiring forces farther left, was received by them at Buena Vista. A shock of cavalry ensued‡—the enemy were divided—one portion traversed the hacienda, worried by the deserters from the battle, and others there, and crossed the western mountain—the other retreated rapidly, under a few rounds from Reynolds' gun, to the eastern base. The dragoons, arrived too late to participate in the struggle.

A fresh body of cavalry, 1500 strong, now dashed down, in splendid style, to overwhelm Davis. Forming an angle, opening to them—Lane extending to the ravine, on his right, and he across the plain, in line—they awaited the charge of the gaudy lancers. On they came, in perfect order, at an easy gallop, expecting a discharge of our pieces, at long range, and then to cut us up. Disappointed, they drew up to a trot—not a shot yet—at 80 yards

\* Davis' regiment had escorted Taylor from Saltillo, and this was its first appearance that day on the field. This regiment had fought gallantly at Monterey.

† This brigade contained about 1000 men. The Kentucky and Arkansas cavalry, in this affair, numbered about 450.

‡ Yell was killed here, and Adjutant Vaughan, of Kentucky, under 24 wounds.

they halted! Then simultaneously pealed the rifle and the musket, emptying many a saddle, and followed by a deadly "*fire by file*," and grape and canister from Sherman, then at hand, the brilliant troopers, and their supporting infantry, were forced back, in utter confusion. Bragg now appeared, with 3 guns—two squadrons of dragoons and one of Arkansans marched upon the enemy's left flank—and all advanced, to drive him, pell-mell, against the mountain.

In the mean time, the conflict on the plateau was going on obstinately, and with doubtful result. At length, Santa Anna, perceiving that his centre column could not carry the ground, against our formidable array of artillery, ordered up the San Patricio battalion, (deserters from our army,) with a battery of 18 and 24 pounders, to mingle in the strife. These heavy pieces swept the entire length of the plateau, and the numerous infantry accompanied them with a rapid fire. Had the reserves been brought forward at this juncture, the day would, in all probability, have been gained. The omission was fatal. At last they gave way—their masses retired, broken in the middle—one half crossing the north ravine, to aid Ampudia; the other fell back to the ravine in front, bearing off Santa Anna himself. The heavy battery continued at the head of the plateau, and opposed to them were the guns of O'Brien, Thomas and Garnett, the others having hastened to the aid of Davis, then in the crisis of his daring effort to resist cavalry in open plain, in line, and the supporting regiments of infantry, which advanced in pursuit of Santa Anna and his defeated and retreating column. The enemy on our left were now between two fires—Davis and the cavalry on their left, with Bragg literally tearing them to pieces, and our troops on the plateau, on their right, and in a few moments 6000 men must have laid down their arms; but a white flag\* appeared, bearing to Taylor the inquiry, *what did he want?* Generous old man, to

\* The Mexican historians make a romantic affair of this flag. They say an officer Montoga became "mived up with the Americans." Objecting to death or capture, he adopted the feint for his own security. Carried to Taylor, he returned with our "two officers of the army," who went for an interview with Santa Anna, and slipped away, unnoticed. The Other Side, page 126. They say, also, that, after O'Brien lost his gun, some persons appeared before Santa Anna, and, as from Taylor, demanded his surrender. To which "original request," that chief, with dignity, refused to accede." Page ditto. All stuff—the American translator puts it right.



respond to such an absurdity! He silenced all our guns, and sent Wool to confer with the enemy. Effecting their purpose of escape, *they would not cease firing*, and did not receive him. A happy stratagem, which saved one-third of their army.

Santa Anna now prepared for his final effort. He witnessed the failure on our left, and resolved, in the absence of much of our force in that quarter, to throw an avalanche of troops upon our centre. He moved his 8 pounder battery nearer to the scene—he ordered up his reserves, and, under Perez, directed them to the plateau. At first, not seeing his object, O'Brien's and Thomas' guns, and Bissell, McKee and Hardin, were far in front, continuing their advance upon the fugitives; but orders were sent to those on our left to hurry to the plateau. Perez, with the reserves, increased now to 12,000 men, emerged from the ravine, where they had been organized, encountered our advance—who, driving one column, dreamed not of the approach of another more formidable—by irresistible numbers forced our infantry to give way,\* and finally to seek shelter in the second gorge. Half of their column enveloped the head of the gorge in a few minutes, passed down its sides, and slaughtered many brave men, without the power of resistance, and, when attempting escape by the outlet upon the road, the hostile cavalry were there to hem them in. But Washington, in a moment, dispersed these last, and our unfortunates found protection under his guns. The other half—soon joined again by the first—pressed across the plain, having only O'Brien and Thomas, with 3 guns, to oppose them—the former near a hundred yards in the advance. The pieces were worked with every ability—the enemy approached in front—assistance was coming in rear—if O'Brien withdrew his guns, they might sweep over the plain before the arrival of succour—if he fought until they reached him his guns would be lost, but they would be temporarily delayed—

\* These regiments were Hardin's, Bissell's and McKee's, the last entire, the others respectively of 8 and 6 companies. Two of the former, at Saltillo, and two of the latter there also, with two others, detached in the morning to reinforce Marshall. They were taken rather by surprise—one regiment in line, another in column of companies, and a third deploying from column of divisions. Hardin, McKee and Clay were killed—the enemy *made no prisoners* on that field. The two last were graduates of West Point Academy. The first was not, although the public prints have asserted it. He was a native of Kentucky—a resident of, and had been in Congress from, Illinois.

aid might arrive, and the day might yet be ours! With generous heroism, he chose the last. He poured into them the iron hail—he shot down their leading files; but on they came! At length, with four or five wounded men, he loaded again—the enemy almost upon him—gave a last fire, with marked effect, and abandoned his guns.\* At that instant, Bragg, under whip and spur, came dashing up the ascent, promptly came “*to action*,” and plied that glorious battery of Ringgold’s,† with a celerity and skill never surpassed. He asked Taylor, near by, for support. “THERE IS NONE,” said he, “BUT MAJOR BLISS AND MYSELF. STAND TO YOUR GUNS AND GIVE THEM (the Mexicans) H——!”‡ And Bragg, like a well-trained soldier, obeyed him to the letter! At only fifty paces—the danger imminent—Thomas alone by his side, he outdid all his former efforts. He tore down the enemy by numerous lines—he annihilated the leading platoons—he checked their progress—they recoiled. Sherman coming, shoulder to shoulder, opened a hundred other avenues of death—they reeled to and fro. Davis and Lane, from the north ravine, appearing upon their right flank, delivered a well-directed fire—and the column yielded ground, and finally rushed from the field! The day was won—“victory perched upon our standard!” With the removal of the enemy beyond our fire ended the great combat, and ended, too, in many respects, the most brilliant feat of arms in American history.§ The enemy’s loss was about 2500,

\* O’Brien had three horses shot under him, and was wounded. He demanded a court of inquiry, to investigate the causes of the loss of his guns. Of course there was but one opinion; yet it prevented all after controversy. His guns were borne off by the Mexicans, and were re-captured by his own regiment, at Churubusco. O’Brien wrote a voluminous, and, for reference, a valuable work, on courts martial. He died of cholera, in Texas, in 1850.

† This battery was carried to Texas by Ringgold, was fought by Ridgely, at Resaca and Monterey, and, at his death, turned over to Bragg, in whose hands its reputation was certainly not diminished.

‡ It was said that Taylor replied, “A little more grape, Captain Bragg.” A good catch phrase, but not true. We give the exact, or nearly the exact words spoken, as we heard them from one of the best authorities.

§ Some cannonading followed the retreat, and our troops pursued the enemy, though without recovering our lost guns; but the day was really over. We have omitted many details, but nothing of importance bearing on the current of events. And we omit the affair at Saltillo. Four infantry companies, under Major Warren, and an artillery company, under Captain Webster, garrisoned the place. Minon made an attempt there, and was repulsed. Lieut. Shover, with a 6 pounder, and Lieut. Donaldson, with a howitzer, pursued him, and did some execution—all very gallantly.

killed and wounded, and several thousand missing. On our side, there were 272 killed, 388 wounded, 6 missing—in all, 666.

On the mere perusal of an account of this battle, the blood courses freer, and all the animal energies are to the utmost aroused. Like Henry Clay, after Monterey, one feels that he, too, "could slay an enemy." The glory of war is magnified, the daring actors in its scenes of hazard and carnage are exalted in estimation, and we become emulous of their deeds of chivalry. The first thought to strike a reflecting mind is, how was it won? how could it be won with such disparity of force? and, more particularly, how could *four guns* of light artillery, whatever the skill of their management, stay the progress of 12,000 soldiers? The result looks like the effect of great magnetic power. All the experience of war, all the rules and maxims of the world's chief warriors, and all the reasoning upon the vast difference of *morale* between two people and two races, would have argued against the possibility of victory, to sixty men at most, against such immense odds! How loudly it speaks for the tenacious courage and the unyielding fortitude of the American soldier, and how much more loudly it speaks for the unsuspected efficiency of the horse artillery, which has been brought to perfection only in our own service. That all engaged in the conflict—save the few deserters—discharged their duty, is not to be doubted; the record discloses the naked truth. If misfortunes, under fortuitous circumstances, or from inability, beset many of them, it was not their fault. Bravery, enthusiasm, perception of the consequences of defeat, were all present, to impel them to superhuman effort. And sure we are that it was exerted. A certain arm of service possessed higher power; yet its success could carry no discredit to the failure of others.

But we mean, briefly, it is true, to notice in detail some of the events of Buena Vista, including the dispositions of the parties, and will indulge in few abstract or declamatory remarks. Our limits and design exclude such grateful pastime, and restrict to severe analysis, and dry, but, it is hoped, not useless, military comments. At no period, within nearly 70 years, has the duty been more urgent on our people to dwell on military topics—to discuss questions relating to war—to acquire and digest the

approved maxims, and to set in progress all those military preparations dictated by a wise forecast; and, if hints are offered, here and there, derived from study of the best authorities, they may not prove untimely nor unprofitable.

The Romans always formed their *order* of battle in the same manner. They encamped in an entrenched square, and, when about to engage in combat, drew out their army in three lines, with intervals of fifty toises (three and a half feet each) between them, and their cavalry on the flanks. From the restoration of the true military system, under Gustavus Adolphus, up to 1792, the principles and the spirit of the Roman organization and line of battle were observed. The experience of subsequent wars, and the constant direction to military studies of so many and such great minds, for a long period, produced some important changes, and tended to perfect military institutions. But throughout this period, of more than 20 centuries, the "*orders*"\* of battle, variable, to a degree, with the general, and somewhat with the position, have undergone little modification, within certain limits, and we find the one most approved at the present day the same that was successful at Sparta and Thebes—the oblique order. Napoleon said truly, that "among the moderns there was no natural order," and that "nothing absolute either can or ought to be prescribed;"† yet, when he said that the oblique order was "*une utopie inapplicable*," Jomini makes issue with the conqueror, shows that many of his greatest battles were gained under it, and leaves the impression that the "line" and the "order" were confounded; and the indiscriminate use of the terms in De Vernon's work, written for the Polytechnic School, under the empire, and sanctioned by the emperor and a board of his officers, confirms it. "The oblique order is a disposition

\* Jomini draws a very just distinction between lines and orders of battle, and he is, we think, the first military writer who has done it. "I call the line of battle the deployed portion, or composed of battalions in column of attack, which an army will take in occupying a camp and ground upon which to receive battle, without a determined object—it is the proper name for troops, formed according to the rules for exercise, in one or many lines. The order of battle on the contrary, is the disposition of troops indicating a *determined manœuvre*, as the parallel order, the perpendicular, etc." *L'Art de la Guerre*, page 214. They are confounded in the *Tactics* for our army—at least the names are.

† Montholon.



tending to unite half the forces, at least, to overwhelm a wing, while holding the other portion beyond reach of the enemy, either in echellons or inclined from the line." Taylor's order resembled this; but neither he nor Wool, perhaps, thought of any particular disposition, but arranged the troops according to the nature of the ground, the Angostura, an essential point to be defended, and the plateau, the probable battle-ground, extending to the left and front. And the centre and left being in echellons, fortifying the remark that "nothing absolute should be prescribed," varied from the system of 12 orders laid down by Jomini, one of which, he supposed, must be inevitably employed in every case. It was an original modification, which he had not conceived. Standing on the defensive,\* with less than half his force (efficient) on the plateau, Taylor, in our judgment, should have planted there all his horse artillery, except Washington's. None was required in reserve. A few more pieces, with O'Brien, would have repelled Pacheco at the outset, and, turning upon Lombardini, well supported, would equally have checked his advance. To break our left—the weak point, seen at a glance by Santa Anna, and promptly improved—would give a reverse fire upon our entire line, when, ordinarily, defeat ensues, and, the communication cut, disaster results. When the flanks are not strengthened, a defensive oblique is liable, therefore, to the above objection. The mountain slope, as Ripley well says, should have been at once occupied, and the front slope, which Marshall ascended first and withdrew from, under the belief that he was ordered, which would have kept off Ampudia from the beginning. The cavalry were properly posted, and, with more guns to have cut up the enemy's horse and annoyed Lombardini, would have proved effective. As it was, there was no alternative but to retire. The strongest point in our

\* Jomini remarks, on defensive combats, "that a general who awaits the enemy like an automaton, without aiming to do more than fight valiantly, will be subdued when he may be attacked. It is not so with him who awaits with the firm resolution to combine decided manœuvres against his adversaries, in order to seize the moral advantage of the *offensive impulse*, and with the certainty of directing his masses on the most important point; in the simple *defensive* this never occurs."—page 219. Taylor falsified the first clause. He combined no manœuvres—was on the simple defensive—only repelled when attacked—and yet triumphed. We will not pause to explain the causes of it.

line was the Angostura,\* and yet the bulk of our force was concentrated around it. Sanguine as Washington was of repelling all efforts there, his confidence was not shared by his seniors—the light artillery, although renowned, was not supposed as effective as it proved to be. Bissell advanced to O'Brien's relief, and McKee and Bragg quickly crossed the road to assist; but their efforts were separate—had they been together, a simultaneous advance might, at that time, have forced back the enemy. And this could have been arranged. The moment the enemy formed his columns, it was perceived that our right, over the gullies, was not threatened, and McKee and Bragg moved away, under the mere advice of Mansfield, and without orders. This was the first crisis of the battle, and, as is seen, it could have been made the last.

Santa Anna's attack upon our whole line at the same time, was contrary to all the rules of the art, and can never be justified, except with a vast superiority of forces. The experience of Mexican armies against Americans, might have told him, that his *real* superiority was not so immense, and should have taught him caution. A few guns and a small force to engage Washington were sufficient; and a similar or less one should, by all means, have menaced us over the gullies. To carry our entire line simultaneously, was a preposterous conception. He advanced in the parallel order, with his right re-inforced. After forcing O'Brien and then Bissell to give ground, Carleton well says, that had his reserves been promptly brought forward, he would have taken the plateau. Sweeping down it to the road—our centre crushed—the Angostura inevitably captured—and our army scattered,

\* Jomini, page 221, deduces the following truths, from a discussion in one of his chapters: "1st. The topographical key of a field of battle is not always the tactical key. 2d. The decisive point of a battle-field is unquestionably that which unites the strategic advantage with the most favourable localities. 3d. When there are no formidable obstacles of ground about the strategic point, this is ordinarily the most important. 4th. Sometimes the determination of this point depends on the positions of the troops respectively—in lines extended or cut up, the centre is the most essential to be attacked—in close lines, the centre is the strongest," etc. Angostura is called the key of Buena Vista. For us it was. It was the strongest point by nature, and was strengthened by art. For the enemy, it was neither the tactical nor topographical point to be attacked—this was our left, as Santa Anna had the military parts to perceive. And as the strategic aim was probably to seize our communications, and operate on the Rio Grande, it is a question if the point selected for attack did not combine all the three requisites.

to be taken in detail, the day would have been his beyond recovery. His timidity—want of perception—or engrossed attention upon a preconceived\* manœuvre, prevented, and it is rarely that a general has two certain opportunities of success in the same combat. He, however, judiciously seized the mountain slope, and with equal judgment saw and struck at our weak points, forcing our left, and taking us in reverse. But even when this was done, the character of the ground precluded the use of artillery, and following up his success, upon the rear of the plateau—the north ravine prevented the last.

The second crisis was at the arrival of Taylor, when our army, in the main, was forced, and when the brilliant achievement of Davis against Ampudia, rescued it from overthrow. Both of Davis' feats were most remarkable, and of all others, perhaps, on that field, prove the extraordinary daring of our soldiers. The first, repelling thousands of infantry and cavalry with 368 riflemen! And again, assisted by Lane, driving back 1500 cavalry, on open plain and formed only in line! His own courage and the quality of his troops disclose the secret. He had many gentlemen in his ranks—there could be no shrinking when he led, and they were tolerably disciplined, and had burnt powder before.

It was contrary to rule for Marshall and Tell to await the charge of cavalry. A maxim says, "*that cavalry, however heavy or firm it may be, must never wait to receive the charge of another body of calvary, not even of light cavalry*;" for the simplest laws of dynamics show, that it must inevitably be overthrown by the velocity of the charging body."† Our men fired their carbines at 60 paces, and the enemy was upon them by the time they could draw their swords. They were not overthrown, because, perhaps, our large horses could sustain the

\* Minon says Santa Anna made no combinations—that he believes "a battle is no more than the shock of men, with much noise, shouts, and shots, to see who can do the most, each in his own way"—and "cannot conceive how it happens that a victory may be gained by wise and well calculated manœuvres"—Carleton—Appendix. We disagree to this. Santa Anna did combine; and his strategem of the white flag, at the proper moment, to save one-third of his army, was very creditable.

† This is sanctioned by Napoleon, if neither in Montholon nor Las Casas. It is said, in the same authority, De Vernon, that when cavalry mean to charge, and are at 600 yards, the first 200 should be in the small trot; the second 200, full trot; the next 150 at a full gallop; and the last 50 paces at full speed,

shock ; and their riders, stout-hearted, would fight under the disadvantage.\*

The last crisis was on the plateau, when O'Brien lost his two pieces, and Bragg and Thomas, with four guns, stopped the career of the reserves. And this was the grandest of all, because the instant fate of our army depended on the successful issue, and for the brilliancy of the achievement. Nothing in the annals of civilized warfare equals this feat—nothing occurs to us as at all comparable to it. The rapidity of the fire—the short distance—the grape and canister—the precision of aim†—and the contrary in the enemy—and the inflexible resolution to die by the guns, combined to effect it. This has been called a battle of horse artillery on our part ; and while we do not and cannot say that others were not essentially instrumental in winning the victory, after a ten hours' struggle of *all* arms, yet certainly without the artillery, the day would have been lost. It was most efficient wherever it was employed. O'Brien, early in the morning, by beautiful firing, drove Ampudia higher up the mountain slope, and beyond his power of elevation. Against Pacheco with more men, and a strong infantry support, he would probably have checked the column, and as it was, he made great havoc in its ranks. Again on the plateau, he retarded Perez, and thus enabled assistance to arrive in season to repulse him. His heroism here merits the highest admiration, and his method of "turning over" guns to the enemy, should never be forgotten. The array of artillery across the plateau, after the retreat of Bowles's regiment, alone prevented the enemy from forcing our centre, with the disastrous consequences which must have ensued. The artillery practice, more especially Bragg's, which all commend, drove the enemy on the left into the *cul de sac*, and combined with that from the plateau, would have compelled a surrender, but for the flag. Washington held his important post against vast odds, and rescued hundreds of men in the gorge, from certain destruction. And finally, this arm closed the contest in a halo of glory, which will encircle it forever.

\* At the battle of Sohr, the Austrians awaited the Prussian charge, and the whole body was destroyed.

† At Zorndorf, one cannon shot mowed down 42 men ! Well served artillery is a most effective arm, and we repeat that the South should encourage the organization of many divisions of the horse artillery.



With some merit, Buena Vista has also been styled, the battle of volunteers. It is very true, that over nine-tenths of the force were of that description of troops, but it must not be inferred that they were *militia*. They were superior to this last, because, if the men were not picked, the ranks were, at least, filled by adventurous and daring spirits, and fortunately, as a general rule, the leading officers were chosen by them, for their *merit*, and not often from personal or political predilection. Besides, if not "baptized in fire," they were partially disciplined—the Illinois regiments had been under most competent and untiring instructors. All the field officers of the Kentucky infantry were West Pointers; and Marshall of the cavalry, and Davis of the rifles, were from the same institution. For a prompt effort, however hazardous—for a sudden grasp at victory, even in the jaws of death, they were inferior to none. Like the Romans of old, they fought more from confidence in individual prowess, than from dependence on the "elbow touch," or the multitude. And the only fear to be apprehended was, that they possessed not that unshrinking fortitude, which could patiently receive the "winged instruments of death," without retort—peculiar to veterans, and which justified the heroic Gen. Michel, in exclaiming at Waterloo, "*the guard dies, but never yields!*" Yet our untried volunteers exhibited even this highest trait of the soldier, in some instances—possibly attributable to the apparently desperate condition of affairs, which nerved the intelligent of all grades—perhaps, to their little instruction—*most* probably to the presence of that indomitable chieftain—a participant of the danger, with the serene aspect of a protected observer—under whose eye they stood, and to win whose approbation, they would have stormed even the Rock of Gibraltar!

Col. Davis in the Senate, said, that Buena Vista was "fought without an erroneous order as to position or time." This may be true, and yet not all the truth. With regard to position\* we have briefly spoken. But during the combat, when sudden manœuvres are often, according to all experience, more effective than the best pre-arranged combinations; General Taylor in several very important movements, gave no orders at all. McKee

\* Col. Davis, it occurs to us, means the placing of troops, and the time of doing so. But we will not alter the text. His speech was delivered Aug. 5th, 1850.

and Bragg left the eminence in rear of the crossing of the gullies, without orders, and arrived timely on the Plateau. Bragg again, in procuring ammunition, perceived Davis' struggle with the 1500 lancers, and hastened to his assistance. Again, when the enemy retreated along the skirt of the mountain, (under the flag,) he supposed a renewed attack would be made on the plateau, and flew there, just at the moment O'Brien abandoned his guns, and without orders; and Davis himself moved against Ampudia without orders.\* But we do not concur with Ripley by any means, in censuring Taylor for the omission, or detracting an item from his conduct of the battle, and the high credit that is due to him. We would rather praise those officers, for quick intelligence and responsible action, for surveying the entire field—perceiving when their services were required, and hastening promptly to render them—in a word, for *anticipating* orders in a crisis, rather than supinely resting on their arms, until the General, at a distant point, should direct by positive instruction, through legitimate channels, their every movement. And, we confidently believe, they only anticipated the orders which would have sent them on the same services which they performed: and that Taylor failed to give the directions, because he saw that they even foreseen, and the proper action begun.

The Mexican historians assert, that if the chief Mexican officers had discharged their duty equally with the subalterns, the result would have been different; and it is possibly true: although, like them, we will not exempt their favorite, Santa Anna, from the imputation. We suspect that he was chary of his person. His horse was shot, it is true, and he was borne along with the retiring column, in the first repulse. But where was he, when the reserves made their grand attack? Was he at their head? Was he in their midst? It strikes us forcibly, that the Mexicans never so much required the lead of Santa Anna, as in this charge. An intrepid chief, in whom all had unlimited confidence, could unquestionably have inspired the enthusiasm, to induce 12,000 men to over-run four guns! A Ney, a Lannes, or a McDonald, as at Wagram, would probably not even have slackened his pace. The

\* Two signal instances of anticipation are found in the defence of Cæsar's camp against the Nervicans, (in 2d Book of Commentaries,) and the march of Dessaix to Marengo, which secured the victory.

The Roman generals were not necessarily exposed, save after defeat, and following the custom of many of them, he remained in the rear, and perhaps beyond the range of our guns. But the Roman armies from incessant drilling during peace, and their exalted *morale*, from almost invincible success, rarely required the inspiring example of their leaders. In modern armies the battle fields are much larger, exacting activity in the General—the use of fire arms, exposes him more or less at all points, and the danger of leading is not much enhanced; while the less experience—the less training—the often diminished *morale* of troops, frequently demand his presence, to insure a victory. Of all periods, over half his forces engaged, and a final effort to overthrow his adversary, this was the one for Santa Anna to appear at their head, and lead them on. Higher, more patriotic interests checked the impulse perhaps, and urged to the security of self. What if Taylor had remained at the hacienda Buena Vista, with a glass, could he have directed his troops with sufficient promptness? Had he not occupied a conspicuous point, amid the carnage, near to the “flashing of his guns,” would the volunteers have exhibited the same valor? Would even his artillery have been served with the same constancy and precision? Whatever their bravery, it is highly doubtful. The example and participation in hazard, of a beloved chieftain, excite his soldiers to extraordinary exertion. When Alexander’s troops were perishing of drought in the desert, a horn of water was brought from afar to the King, who, instead of drinking, poured it upon the sands before all eyes, and it quenched the thirst of the entire army! Cæsar marched bareheaded before his army in Gaul, in all weathers, and they advanced at his order, in sunshine or in storm. And Hannibal and Napoleon trudged on foot through the snows of the higher Alps, and dispelled both fatigue and cold from their followers. So Taylor in that doubtful crisis—amid the horrors of war, and exposed to every shot, neutralized the appalling danger to his troops, inspired into them his own fearless resolution, and they won for him his noblest field!\*

Taylor’s conduct at Buena Vista was comparatively faultless. The few errors that a severe criticism may de-

\* Our limits exclude many reflections that we should have been pleased to offer.

fect, are unimportant. Eminent success attended him, as in all the efforts of his career: and invariable success, through a life of vicissitudes and of high responsibilities, marks the enlightened judgment, rather than the favor of inconstant fortune. He displayed the energy, the fortitude, the quick perception and prompt action, and the valor of the great captain; and, likewise, the ready decision and iron firmness, when he exclaimed "*we will decide the battle here.*" It was a rare instance of sublime self-reliance, akin to that "destiny" of exalted genius, which impels it to superhuman trial. With the heroic, he displayed equally the tenderer virtues of the man. His humanity was his crowning grace; and the illustrious sentiment, "I WILL NEVER, ALIVE, LEAVE MY WOUNDED BEHIND!" should be inscribed upon each chieftains banner, and enshrined in the heart of every soldier. H.

---

ART. VI.—IS SOUTHERN CIVILIZATION WORTH PRESERVING?

1. *The Union, Past and Future.* By a citizen of Virginia. Washington and Charleston. 1850.
2. *The Compromise Acts.* Washington. 1850.

It is accomplished! All that the South has been protesting against for the last three years has been completed; all that the North has demanded has been substantially granted. The question has been fairly tried, and it is solemnly decided that the entire machinery of a common government is to be employed for the sole benefit of one portion of the country, and the government is convinced that the other portion is so weak in its purposes and resources, that no heed is to be taken of its arguments, its remonstrances, its warnings. Usurpation, almost incredible in extent, has been based upon this conviction. But for a firm reliance upon the want of power and determination in the South, the North had not dared to urge its encroachments, even as experiments, much less to have pressed them to their temporary consummation. This is a sad thing to tell, that tyranny is bold because it deems us imbecile. But what tyranny has its grasp upon us? of what encroachments do we complain?



what powers of government are used against us? why, under a common government, speak of North and South, and say *we* only when speaking of the latter? Let us see. Let us look upon the reasons, as men who have mighty issues tendered to them, and are determined to discern their full import.

To take a comprehensive view of our present condition, let us single out from the rest of the world, these United States and consider them as a nation. Every nation must be viewed in a double aspect—that is, with regard to other nations, and with regard to itself. The first characteristic that will strike an inquirer, is, that the nation we are now considering is a republic: an observation early made, either with respect to itself, or in relation to the rest of the world. But in looking to itself alone, in making an analysis of its component parts, and tracing their mutual connection and relation, the fact is detected, that this vast republic is made up of a number of separate, and, in many respects, independent republics, differing essentially in numbers, wealth, size and policy; but all constituted, by the solemnest compact, equals, as integral fractions of the great whole. The next process must be to classify these individual governments or States, and range them in groups, distinguished by important peculiarities. Homogeneousness or diversity of population will be, perhaps, the first point of inquiry: whence came the people who have overrun the new world? are they from the same origin? do they spring from one common race? Examination discloses, that in about one-half of these integral fractions, the population consists of a white Caucasian race, sparsely intermingled, here and there, with an insignificant proportion of the descendants of some of the black African tribes. In the other half, the same two races co-exist, but their proportion is materially changed, there being, in point of number, about an equality between them. In neither division are they fused together or considered as equals; in both, the blacks occupy a situation, socially and politically, inferior to the whites, who are, in all places, the governing race. A glance at the map shows that the small proportion of Africans is found in the northern and the large in the southern parts of the nation, and a geographical line decides the division between them. Looking to the causes which have placed distinct races upon the same area, it is seen that, to both

divisions, the white came by spontaneous immigration; the black by enforced transportation. And the involuntary removal of the latter from Africa was effected, as a commercial operation, by the joint efforts of a now foreign power and that portion of the nation which, in the early period of its colonization, was the most mercantile in its pursuits. Upon their first introduction, they were more equally distributed than at present, and, in all places, were held in bondage for the sake of their labour. In course of time, they were subjected to and obeyed the law of civilization, in the emigration of labour, and gradually tended to that quarter where climate and other circumstances assisted their increase and made their labour most beneficial. In all places, they were brought over to be slaves. As, under the law alluded to, they decreased in number at the North, and were supplied in part by other labour, they were gradually released from bondage, but have never been admitted to the full rights of their former owners. In the South, the old relations have not been disturbed; many regulations and improvements have been introduced, but this is not the place to advert to them. The first grand distinction, then, is that the North is not slaveholding; the South is, and the slavery is that of a race markedly different from the dominant one. Thus the first classification is based upon a social organization, existing in some and not prevailing in others of the States. In other respects, (politically considered,) they mainly agree, and whatever differences broadly exist are connected with this distinction—a distinction which is admitted, on all sides, to have exercised a controlling influence upon the character and pursuits of the governing population, and the resources and condition of the country.

The history of our present form of government must next be considered, to see the relation in which these two great sections stand to it, and to each other. The chief difficulty, in framing the constitution, arose from the very question of slavery, and it never would have been framed, but upon the ground that this subject was to be left to each part of the country to arrange for itself, without interference or molestation by the other, and the federal government was to extend its protection to the holders of slaves, the same as to the owners of any other property. The central authority was to protect the institu-

tion, as a matter of property, but no other power over it was given. Fugitives from labour, it was expressly stipulated, should be delivered up on demand. The escape of a slave into a State where the relation of master and slave did not exist, was to confer no benefit upon him—the law of ownership was to attach to him, no matter in what jurisdiction he was found. And not only were the then existing slaves guaranteed in this way to their owners, but their further “*importation*,” up to a fixed time, was distinctly recognized. The great principle, of the equality of all the sections, pervades the whole constitution, and gives vitality to its every portion. The right of each State to decide what is property remained untouched, and, with the power, it became the duty of the general government to defend that decision, and give protection to property. Checks and balances were framed, with a special view to this end. Slavery was recognized by the constitution, and non-slavery was equally admitted; but anti-slavery had no authority in the government. Between slavery and non-slavery the balance of power was nicely poised, and its equilibrium adjusted. Such was the original compact; such was the only compact which could have been formed, and such it was intended to remain forever. Is it so now? Who dare answer it is? Equality is destroyed, slavery proscribed, the entire North, no longer merely non-slavery, is unanimously anti-slavery, and has compelled the federal government itself to be positively, openly, actively, anti-slavery. The North is the government; the South holds nothing under the constitution—bare sufferance is her only tenure.

How has it been effected? What has changed the substance of government, without affecting its form? What consequences must follow upon the change? Let us see. Constant and gradual aggression has marked the stages which were necessarily passed through, before the present position of things could be reached. To write a full history of the changes of our government, it would be requisite to examine the relations of the North and South, produced by the too generous cession of the north-west territory, by the State of Virginia. But our space requires us to deal more immediately with the rapid usurpations of the last few years, and we commence with the admission of Missouri into the Union. For the present, it will sufficiently answer our purpose, to show

the daring aggressions, since that time, of the North upon the South, and the deplorable condition of the latter at present. The narrative will develop the fact, that in all the agitations which have taken place, the North has been the attacking party; the South has stood on the defensive. Let the South, too, mark well the important truth, that every gain on the part of the North, every stride towards absolute dominion, has been in the name and under the guise of a "compromise." Every movement against us has been carried by the plea of "conciliation," and every surrender, on our side, has been always a "final adjustment." Strange that, in every compromise, the South has never gained one single point, nor received one additional guarantee for her rights.

From our previous remarks, it is perceived that the agitations are not of recent origin. More violent now than ever, they date from the early history of the constitution, and leave little room for doubt that they are inherent in the very nature of our government, and can be destroyed only by a radical change. Always has the excitement grown from the attempt, on the part of the North, to array the federal power in direct hostility to slavery. Ordinary party conflicts, and the struggle for possession of the spoils of office, were unfortunately so eager as to prevent the attention which so serious a subject, in common prudence, demanded of the South. In the midst of political contest, few heeded the existence of political abolition. At those moments, however, when party strife had ceased for an instant, and weary partizans were employing their leisure in contriving new schemes for their advancement, this being of discord would rear its horrid head, and proclaim its unfaltering determination, to achieve its purposes. Long was it disregarded by the many. In ample time, the great conservative statesman of the age, the unrivalled intellect of the American world, raised his voice of warning. He was disregarded; inferior minds would not admit the existence of a more far-seeing intelligence than their own; less heroic spirits feared to meet a danger which might be postponed; party spirit preferred taking counsel from our natural opponents, and so the South looked calmly on, as if the matter were of no concern. Supineness did not prevent a return of the evil, and, at each re-appearance, it had grown in size and strengthened in audacity.



Northern men, who at first bade it defiance, were at each return more obedient to its wishes. Aroused to its importance, the South yet yielded to its demands, upon what were termed, to gloss the cowardice of surrender, unimportant points, (as if any guaranty of liberty was unimportant,) in the vain hope, by timely concession, of appeasing its fury. Each concession, as had been predicted, encouraged renewed exaction—every position gained served as a point d'appui for further operations against the constitution and against us.

In narrating the particulars of these proceedings, we recite a series of triumphs gained by the united North over the divided South. The first great triumph to which we recur, was the fatal error by which the South acceded to the mis-called Missouri Compromise, when the North demanded and received the surrender of a large portion of slave territory, as the price of admission of a slave State to the Union. It was a sad mistake. However, it was then proclaimed that the North had gained all she would ever ask, and the question was settled forever. The South acquiesced as a concession to the Union, which, however, since that time, has ceased to be of any value to her, save as a matter of sentiment. In reality it was no tribute to the Union, but a surrender to anti-slavery, with which the government was designed to have no connexion. Yet, ever since made, it has been sustained by the South as a binding compact sorely to her disadvantage, but to be preserved with the sacred respect due to a solemn treaty. This was the first point gained. We shall not allude to the Tariff, although it is a branch of the same question. It is but shallow observation, which does not perceive in the design and development of the protective system, that it was an attempt to tax slave labor for the benefit of the free States. Hence, the ready acceptance of the system by the North, and in spite of all the casuistry used, the instinctive repulsion of the South. Nor will we discuss the modes by which the popular mind of the North was induced to concentrate its powers and prejudices against the institutions of the South, for at present we only desire to call attention to the movements by which were sought possession and control of the Federal Government. With a profound policy, slavery in the District of Columbia was selected as the next object of attack. The selection was masterly: it was the strategy

of Napoleon. The whole attacking force was thrown upon the weakest points of the antagonist, where a like force could not be concentrated. The result has proved in this instance the correctness of the calculation. The South denied the jurisdiction of Congress, but permitted Congress to assume jurisdiction. Who can now doubt what would have been the effect of a stern assertion of right, backed by its resolute maintenance. But the "compromise" was again brought into play: the great right of petition was all that was sought: let that be accorded, and it might be amicably argued how much of her rights the South was to be permitted to enjoy. Again the South yielded. The warning of incorruptible patriotism was disregarded. In vain Cassandra cried aloud that the wooden horse should not be admitted within the walls. (Will we arouse, ere Troy be wrapped in flames?) Southern men of pliant disposition, with eyes fixed upon federal office, could easily be persuaded that the most effectual way to strengthen the main defences, was to surrender the outworks. A few cheap compliments to expanded views and patriotic conciliation, and obsequious Southerners threw open the doors, while the arrogant abolitionist stalked into the Council Hall of the nation, and throwing his insolent petitions before the members, demanded, as of right, he should be heard and obeyed. Who does not remember how many Southern representatives returned home to chant Pæans to the Union, and assure their too confiding constituents that their rights were secure, and agitation at an end. How far-seeing their statesmanship, time has already told.

This point gained, the Anti-Southern party were dexterous in its use. The spot which occupies the attention of the whole country was their theatre, and the people were their audience. At any other place, no matter how strong their efforts, their success at best could be only local. But here every petition was to the whole North, and every declaimer spoke at once to the whole Northern population. They seized upon the press, and no Southern argument was allowed a hearing at the North. As their numbers increased, they daily brought under control some portion of the two great political parties, until both were compelled to be competitors in the bidding for the favor of those, whom recently they had represented to the South as too insignificant to merit notice. Very soon those who

co-operated with them became infected with their spirit. They had commenced by lending themselves to certain views, and ended by adopting them. Fanaticism often commences with hypocrisy: the hypocrite easily becomes a fanatic. Rapidly and inevitably, the old desire of the North for the political inferiority of the South, became converted into an intense determined wish for her utter subjection. At length, some four years since, every point which it was deemed advisable seriously to attack had been carried, and to achieve a full victory over the South, the North only waited the time when its power should have sufficiently increased. There was no haste for this: the forms at least of the Constitution were to be respected though its spirit might be violated, and the event was to be postponed until the period, when by rapid increase from immigration, and the working of the government, it should be enabled, by a change of the Constitution, to pass the final judgment upon an institution, which in advance had been pronounced to be doomed. Matters stood thus, when a sudden change in affairs prevented an opportunity of quickly effecting what otherwise would have been a work of time. Was the opportunity neglected?

On the 8th of May, 1846, the first battle of the Mexican war was fought. The conflict with Mexico was brief: its result was never doubtful. Little more than two years placed the United States in possession of 570,000 square miles of territory, which had been previously the undisputed domain of Mexico. In this is not included any portion of the territory claimed by Texas. This had been acquired by the nation: as a nation, in common justice it should have been enjoyed. But now came the contest. The North claimed it should be enjoyed by the section which was the majority of the nation in point of number: the South claimed it should be held by the whole equally. Mark the difference. The North claimed it not merely for a majority, but for a *section*: the South claimed it for the Union. The first demanded it for themselves as the majority: the latter insisted it should be held under the federal compact, which alone constitutes the nation. The North required it in the name of power and anti-slavery—the South asked at least a portion for the sake of justice, equality and the Constitution. It insisted upon that instrument and the compromises which had

been made to preserve it; the North looked beyond the Constitution and denied the binding effect of former compromises. The sphere of operations was then immediately changed, and for a paramount reason. If the South could have obtained its fair share of territory, slave State and free State would still continue to be admitted *pari passu*, and the balance of power be maintained. But if the North could obtain all, the great object would no longer be postponed, the poise of the Constitution was at an end, and nothing stood in her way to obstruct progress to absolute dominion. Every contrivance was rapidly set at work to effect the object. Former pretences were abandoned, and the boldness of dictation showed its own sense of power. With united voice, the whole North proclaimed "no more slave States shall be admitted into the Union;" Northern States in their sovereign capacity endorsed the assertion; the Wilmot Proviso was devised and pressed to prevent Southern emigration to the new territory, and the whole weight of Northern prejudice, sentiment and influence, was brought to bear upon the point. It is worthy of a passing remark, that to gain these territories, the Southern States furnished two-thirds of the men, and by the operation of the financial system of the General Government, will have to pay three-fourths of the expenses of acquisition.

While these agitations continued, and before Government could act upon the newly acquired territory, Oregon came before Congress for a territorial government. In reliance upon the contract embraced in the Missouri Compromise, the South was willing to allow its organization to be adjusted under that compromise. But the occasion was seized to display the power of the North, and impress the anti-slavery principle upon the Government. The anti-slavery proviso was adopted by Congress, and the Bill was signed by the Executive. Let this be observed. A Southern President disapproving, the measure did not dare employ the power given him by the Constitution to check the action of Congress. This power often exerted by him, favorite in its exercise to his party, could not stand before the forces arrayed to compel him to submission. But what matter is Oregon, again said Southern recusants in Washington? We could not go there with our slaves, we have lost only *an abstraction*. We will see in the course of this article, how accurate



was their knowledge, or how pure their truth in making this assertion. For the present, granting the fact, let us trace the abstraction. The anti-slavery proviso was inserted by one of two authorities. Either to carry out the Missouri Compromise, or by virtue of inherent power in Congress sufficient for the purpose. Now either branch of the dilemma may be chosen. If the first, then the Missouri line should in every case be carried out in all territories to the Pacific coast. Has this been done? If not, then the Missouri Compromise has been adhered to on our side, and fraudulently avoided on the other. But if the other proposition be chosen, then the General Government has full, exclusive jurisdiction over the subject of slavery in the territories, and has used its power to abolish it. The Federal Government then actually is, at this moment, an anti-slavery, abolition government. This last is the alternative chosen by the North, for they have disclaimed the Missouri Compromise, and the conclusion we have drawn is the "abstraction" they have gained.

Thus during the agitation upon other points, the steady, strong, onward march of anti-slavery, planted it in full force upon Oregon. This was another gain, and signaled the year 1848. At the commencement of the session of 1849-'50, the matter stood thus: We were in possession of 570,000 square miles of territory, comprising California, New Mexico and Utah. The power and wealth of the United States, as a nation, had acquired these territories, and the nation had drawn by far the largest portion of its resources for conquest from the Southern States. The South now claimed an interest in a portion of these acquisitions: anti-slavery claimed all. Congress met and Congress has adjourned. A series of bills making what has been termed a "compromise" measure has passed, and where are we?

Slavery is forever prohibited in California.

Slavery can't go to New Mexico or Utah.

A large territory has been taken from the slave State of Texas, to be added to the free territory of New Mexico.

The slave trade has been abolished in the District of Columbia.

This is the anti-slavery progress of the last twelve months. Not only have we lost every point we made, but additional insults upon unexpected topics have been

heaped upon us. As a set off to all this, Congress has passed a Fugitive Bill, (its plainest duty under the Constitution,) which has already been practically repealed, and which its framers well knew never could be enforced.

But what of all this? Is not the Union safe? Has not federal patronage increased? The world still looks upon us with admiration, let us join the North in her exultation at the success of measures, which gain for her only abstractions! Thus have spoken Southern politicians to mask timidity or treachery. Let us put their measures to the test. Begin with California, and see if practically, we have lost nothing more than abstract right.

Perhaps it will startle those who have been in the habit of taking their ideas, either at first or second hand, from the Northern press, to hear it asserted that California is by nature peculiarly a slaveholding State. Nevertheless, the fact is so. Wherever gold has been found in any abundance, it has been obtained principally by slave labor. No matter what name it has assumed, serfdom in some places, peonage in others, still it is a great fact that gold digging has always been performed mainly by slave labor. Efforts have been made to substitute machinery, and English capitalists have expended vast sums upon costly engines for that purpose. It has all proved a failure. The capital has been sunk, the attempts have been abandoned, and the machines now lie rusting by the side of the mines which are still worked by slave labor. There is not just at present sufficient information at our hand to enable us to trace the process of failure, but the fact is general: gold mines are wrought only by slave labor. But in California especially, the aid of machinery is dispensed with, in obtaining the rich product of its plains. Manual labor is the only mode yet found profitable, and the only mode ever requisite. The rude implements of the gold washer of California are scarce one grade beyond the agricultural instruments of the most primitive people. They require no ingenuity in contrivance, no capital in construction. On the contrary, it would seem that, precisely in proportion to the complexity and cost of a machine, has been the inverse ratio of its success. A pick and shovel for digging, a bowl for washing, these are all the labourer requires, to make the gold-impregnated soil yield its rich burthen. The operations, simple and uniform, require no great skill in their performance,

and, by the plainest of means, he is put in possession of the great currency of the world, as the immediate result of his labour. Exempt from the usual laws of production, he needs no intermediate aid to render his products available in the market of the world, for that which he produces is the standard, by reference to which exchanges are everywhere performed. Agency is dispensed with : no carrier is needed, to transport a bulky commodity to a distant market ; no factor is employed, between the owner of the yield of the earth, and the manufacturer, who is to give it consumable form. All the intermediate processes are avoided, except, perhaps, coinage, upon which the seignorage is so trifling as not to be worth mention here, and, indeed, for all the large operations of commerce, and its results to the world, bullion need not undergo even this small operation.

From these statements, it is apparent that, in California, *labour is exempt from the control of capital*, a characteristic much distinguishing that country from the rest of the world, where labour and capital are found. Of course, this is mainly to be applied to the gold region. In the cities, and for financial and speculative purposes, accumulation and combinations of capital will preserve some of their general power. But in the mines, as all labour is, or may be, equally valuable, as it needs no capital to commence with, and its products are not enhanced by a combination with capital, the value of labour is as great to the labourer as it is to the capitalist. Hence capital cannot hire labour, because the wages of the labourer will of course be that sum which he hopes to make for himself, deducting the cost of maintenance in either case. Capital engages labour for profit, and no profit can accrue from such a contract, and none such will be made. For illustration, if the rewards of gold washing be taken to average ten dollars per day, it is evident that the capitalist cannot pay more than that sum to the labourer ; it is equally evident the labourer will not hire himself for less. He stands in no enforced subjection to capital, as he does elsewhere. He has no instruments of value to provide, no land to buy ; his muscles and organs furnish the only machinery required, and the product of his labour is of that one class which possesses general, immediate and final value. Besides, in this, as in all industry of a speculative nature, there is the faith which each individual

has in his own good fortune, which would prevent the labourer's accepting as hire even more than the average rate of profits. To what use, then, can capital, as it is accumulated, be put, in the mines? As matters now stand, to little or none, for the purpose of mining. Capital and labour are disunited.

But if we now suppose introduced upon that area a class of labourers capable themselves of being property, the union of capital and labour will be re-established, not in conflicting but harmonious relation, as we shall elsewhere show. The accumulation of capital will be expended in the purchase of such labourers, and the increased production of gold thence arising, will give still larger and larger means of continued return and re-investment. For farther illustration, let us suppose the value of a day's labour to be ten dollars, and the price of a slave to be a thousand dollars. Under the present state of things, when a man has worked for one hundred days he has gained one thousand dollars; but what can he do with this sum, in aid of his labours? Nothing, actually nothing. As we have already seen, he cannot hire more labour, he cannot assist his own by machinery. His gold, hidden for safety, lies as idly as in the original mould of earth, and his labour continues to receive the same return, only, as at first it did, with no accelerated ratio of increase from the accumulation of property. Slavery introduced, his thousand dollars would be expended in the purchase of a slave, and their joint labour would reduce the time for a like accumulation to one-half, that is to fifty days. Succeeding purchases would yet more reduce the time, in a certain increasing ratio, until the owner would cease to dig in person, and occupy himself with the direction of his labourers. No limit can be assigned to this process, short of the entire occupation of the golden area and the exhaustion of the placers. The numbers employed have been assumed for illustration, and not for calculation, and consequently make no pretension to accuracy. Rapidity of gain may be over-estimated or underrated, and the ratio, of course, be not precise; but the principle would, in any case, be the same.

In addition to this, California is not only the land for slavery, but it is emphatically the place for *negro slavery*. This arises from physical causes. The period for working



the placers is during the hot season. In the autumn the rainy season sets in, and lasts until spring. During its continuance, the tempestuous rain drives man from the open air, the earth is saturated with water, the streams become torrents, the floods sweep away all barriers and fill all excavations, and labour is, perforce, suspended, until the elements have exhausted their career. With the cessation comes a season scarcely more genial. The clouds which veiled the sun withdrawn from his presence, his rays beat down with fierceness, rendered still more oppressive by the steam which rises from the muddy surface of the earth, and, when once the moisture is exhaled, no refreshing showers fall to cheer the workman, but he must delve on, in a baked and hardened crust, which reflects back the heat, all but insupportable to the white man. Hence the trying severity of the work to those who are occupied with it. Letter after letter recites, in touching language, the trials of the miners; the plains are covered with their graves; shattered constitutions hurry from the spot, to linger or die in the homes whence they departed, and the number of diggers is preserved only by constant recruits from the vast army of emigrants, whom the "auri fames" hurries from other places. But in such time the negro is in circumstances most congenial to his nature. Clad in the "shadowed livery" in which his fathers, for five thousand years, have withstood the beatings of a tropic sun, with a constitution furnished him, in the great orderings of providence, to withstand its effects, he grows strong with warmth, and rejoices in the heat beneath which the white child of a northern race sinks faint and exhausted. And yet this is the country which we have so often been assured is totally unfit for slavery; where it is forbidden by the "laws of God." Southern men, "good, easy souls," have implicitly believed it, because told so to do. Such, at least, were the assertions, while it was necessary to keep Southern influence from entry upon the domains, which Northern cupidity had marked for its own. But now that the deed has been done—now that the deluded South has been expelled the paradise of free soil, and the flaming sword guards the gates, to prevent our entrance—it is admitted that constitution and strong laws were necessary, to repeal the natural law of slavery in California. Let us take the testimony of one well acquainted with the Pacific coun-

try, and who speaks with no prejudice in favour of the South. Some time last summer Horace Mann addressed a note to Mr. Thurston, the congressional delegate from the territory of Oregon, as to the fitness of Oregon, California, New Mexico and Utah for slave institutions. The reply is conclusive. Not only does Mr. T. positively assert that California, New Mexico and Utah are naturally slave countries, but he goes farther, and informs us that the profits of slave labour in Oregon would be double what they are in any Southern State. Indians, whose powers of work are not to be compared to those of the negro, receive from two to three dollars a day; household servants from five to six hundred dollars a year. The wages of a negro man in California, for the past year, would have been from eight hundred to a thousand dollars, and, from his knowledge of New Mexico and Utah, he does not doubt that they, equally with California, abound in gold, and would be as valuable in their returns to slave labour. Mr. T. concludes his letter with the following sentences:

"The greatest impediments which white labour has to encounter in the mines are the intensity of the heat and the prevalence of bilious disease. The one is almost insufferable, while the other is pestilential; against both of these the negro is almost proof." "Hence, were I a Southern man, and my property invested in slaves, I should consider the markets in New Mexico, Utah and California, for slave labour, worthy of a honourable contest to secure."

We are in possession of private letters, from gentlemen of high intelligence, who have been over the gold region of California, and their testimony is to the same effect. Even after the admission of California, with her constitution forbidding slavery, one of her Senators, Mr. Gwin, had to urge upon Congress the necessity of a law, by which peonage would be prevented; so strong is the tendency to this organization of labour in the mines.

*Thus California should have been ours*; yet, for the present, at least, we have lost it. We have no part in the heritage of this country. Our birthright has been sold for a mess of pottage—to our politicians. The brand is upon us; our own government has affixed the stigma. Our institutions are polluted, and we must acquiesce in the edict and bless the hand that signed it. Bitter is the

reflection, that it has all been caused by Southern supineness and treachery. Who can doubt that, when, some three years since, the insulting cry of free soil was first shouted, a stern, unflinching demand for our rights would have made that cry harmless. But Southern politicians assured the people the idle cry would pass by, the people believed, and—California is gone! What have we lost? Do we realize it? Let us look at it closely.

We have, as a people, lost all right to participate in the results of a conquest, for which we furnished a large majority of the means; we have lost our equality in the distributed powers of the government; we are shut out, forever, from access to the Pacific shore, and from all share in the mighty commerce which is to spring up between the American and Asiatic continents. Commerce and civilization have run their course from east to west, until, spanning the globe, the point is reached where the West touches the East. But we may not stand upon the spot where the men, of whom the last page of history is being written, stretch their hands to those who still occupy the soil which was the cradle of the race. We bought and paid for it with blood and treasure; but every inch of that ground is covered, *and covered in order to exclude us*. Take the distance from Florida to Maine, on the Atlantic, and stretch the same length upon the opposite ocean, and you have the water line of that vast State, whose boundaries were fixed to wall us out from the Pacific. "For God's sake, take all!" said the emissary of the federal government to the convention of California, when they hesitated upon such a monstrous usurpation. In prompt compliance, they took all;\* we have none.

What would have been the effect if the territory had been left open to us, without fear of molestation? Can any one doubt the amount of emigration which would have wended its way from the South? By this time, thousands of young, intelligent, active men (our Southern country abounds with them) would have been in that region, having each carried with them from one to five or ten slaves; their own property or the advances of another, (in most cases a parent,) to work upon shares. With constitutions and institutions suited to the work,

\* Debates in California Committee.

what limit could be assigned to their success? Their labours would have benefited all the South. The gold they obtained would have flowed into the Southern States, or gone into the commerce of the world, to enhance the value of our other products. Labour would have been withdrawn from the culture of cotton, and, whilst the yield of that staple would have diminished, its value would have appreciated. The general ability of the world to purchase, from the increase of the precious metals, would have raised in price all the staples of the exporting States. The scene of prosperity which would have been exhibited upon our area would have been without a parallel in any nation upon which the sun has ever shone. Nor would the advantages have ended here. Northern emigrants, witnessing the effects of slave labour in the mines, would soon have become purchasers and competitors for the purchase of slaves. Their value in the Southern States would have been increased by hundreds of millions of dollars, and, inseparably linked with their value, all other kinds of property would have experienced a like appreciation. With the increase of value of slaves would have come increase of comfort to the slave himself, for, contrary to the fact in other relations of labourer and employer, the comforts of the slave always increase with the ability of the owner to render those comforts. The area of purchasers, extended beyond our immediate limits, would have given a direct interest to tens of thousands from the North to understand and defend our institutions. Thus wealth and strength would have combined, in the increase of our means and our power. This is all lost. Duped, by means which it would disgrace imbecility to yield to, we have lost it all. We have yielded our right—we have confessed our inferiority—we have listened to the song of the syren, and, by its enchanting delusions, have been deprived of a country as rich as if the golden rays which the sun strews upon his path, in daily leave-taking of our continent, had been crystallized into metal. We have lost yet more: we have lost the respect of our oppressors and our confidence in ourselves. A most memorable lesson, that a people so ignorant or supine as to part with any rights, abstractions though they be, will soon be made to deplore their folly, (if they retain intelligence enough to deplore any thing,) by suffering in their material interests.



Movements which effected these results have been directed against us on account of our one particular institution. Hostility to slavery, upon which is based the very existence of the South, has caused it all. What is this aggression upon our fundamental organization but hostility to ourselves? It is in vain to say the North has no hostility to the South—hostility to slavery is hostility to the South. You cannot speak, you cannot think of the South, without slavery. *It is included in her idea.* As well try to imagine a living body without organs. And, when a blow is levelled at the support of a nation, the desire is to see that nation fall.

“ You take our lives,  
When you do take the means whereby we live.”

We occupy the same relations towards New Mexico and Utah that we do towards California. Cunningly devised, to entrap easy consciences, their territorial government as effectually excludes slavery as would a direct prohibition. And yet, so far as we can learn, the abundance of precious metals found, under the same circumstances as in California, renders slavery equally desirable. With the policy which has marked the free soil movement, every point has been gained, in such manner as to leave for Southern treachery the semblance of an apology for a form, while the substance has been haughtily seized. Provision, it is true, has been made for the admission of these territories as States, with or without slavery, as they may choose; but what choice have they, when slavery is forbidden them in the territorial condition; when slaves are excluded, up to the moment of the formation of their constitutions? Loud boasts have been made by honourable gentlemen, of the vast benefits they have secured the South by this arrangement. They secure the arrangement! Why, it was tossed to them, in derision and contempt, by men who scorn a traitor whilst they use him. It was as a blind and mockery for their people. The Mexican law abolished slavery in those territories, and to that law, without power of change, the institution has been submitted. All other organizations of labour are permitted; white apprenticeship, Indian peonage; but the moment the negro “ touches the sacred soil of ” New Mexico—soil purchased, it may be, by drops of his

master's blood—he becomes not only free, but, under the Mexican law, the equal of his master. By this law, no distinction of race or colour is recognized as a requisite for citizenship; hence, by first emancipating the negro slave, and then instantly recognizing his capacity as a citizen, it does the work much more effectually than the Wilmot Proviso, which only freed the negro, but proposed to him no civic rights. Whilst the feeble courtiers of power strove to conceal these facts, the great originator of the measure, the arch emancipator by compromise, Henry Clay himself, over and over again proclaimed them to the country. Towering above his petty allies whom he had forced to his support, in the pride of his might and force of his will, he disclaimed the small subtleties and miserable apologies of his subordinates: from the inception of his measures up to the moment of their passage, he never ceased to repeat that their whole scope and design was to exclude slavery from the territories. In the presence of his crouching minions, again and again he pledged his own, and the opinions of the ablest jurists of the country, to the effectiveness of the means he had contrived. Nothing short of the entire exclusion of slavery would satisfy him, and he stands pledged to come to the rescue of free soil, when one slaveholder as such, shall attempt intrusion upon its domains. The Wilmot Proviso he threw aside, it was no instrument of his, but he substituted the “Mexican Proviso,” a more ingenious, much more effective contrivance. Is this less galling to us? Does it appease our honor that the North should gain their object by requiring that we should be subjected to the laws of a conquered people? It is Fallstaff's honor which is thus satisfied.

But the entire possession of these vast empires could not satisfy the rapacity of free soil. Its triumph was not complete by the seizure of new acquisitions: to be satisfied of its own strength, it must grasp something which had theretofore been the undisputed domain of slavery. Texas was selected for the sphere of operations, and thus an unexpected blow was aimed at a vital part of the South. Possession of territory was not enough, State sovereignty had to bow submissively to its demands, and those demands were to be promulgated through the President of the U. States. The Executive obeyed, and gave the last confirmation that the Federal Government was

purely anti-slavery. Can any one doubt that no President would have dared issue Fillmore's proclamation against a Northern State, for claiming jurisdiction over territory under like circumstances with Texas? The feeblest Northern State would have been too strong for the mightiest Executive to have assaulted: public opinion would have drawn harmlessly all the electricity from such a cloud. But Texas was slaveholding, and the experiment might safely be tried. All parties at the North would rally to a man around the Government in an issue with a Southern State, and as for the South—alas, the South had so often submitted to federal usurpation, that no cabinet need consider her interest, or consult her wishes. Purse and sword corruption and intimidation were combined; who doubts which was the stronger weapon? The object was effected, the domain of Texas is annexed to the free soil of New Mexico, and a dismembered sovereignty does homage to the demon of misrule. And this is a compromise.

To complete this compromise, the slave trade has been abolished in the District of Columbia. Attentive examination will shew this to be one of the worst acts of the session. The outrage was done upon a small scale, but it was most daring. In the first place, there was no call for the act, and it shows how strong is the reliance upon our blindness, when such an authority was exercised as part of a compromise. But the chief danger is in the penalty. Mark that well. Whoever violates the law, forfeits his slave: not only that, but the slave is made free. The owner is punished, and liberty, by *act of Congress*, is given to the slave. The sentence passed upon the owner is that the slave shall be free. Now if free in one place, is he not free every where? If freed by Government, must it not recognize and defend his freedom all the world over? Is he not free North and South, as well as in the District of Columbia? Must not a Federal Judge, if called upon, recognize it in the State of Georgia, and maintain it too by civil process and military force? Is not the whole power of the Government pledged to his support? It must be so, and the great fact is now established, *that by act of Congress a slave can be made free*. Slavery in the District cannot last another session under such view of the powers of Congress. Still beyond this it can be demonstrated, that this

measure stands in intimate and necessary connection with the prevention of slavery in the territories. The great design of both is to interfere with *slavery emigration*, and to cramp it with laws not natural to emigration. Our space does not permit tracing the connection at length; the suggestion will show why it was necessarily the supplement of a compromise, which forbids slavery to extend in any direction. It is preliminary to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and if the patient South submit, in the arsenals, dock yards, forts, and other places of federal jurisdiction, and the regulation of its commerce between the States.

From these considerations, we assert that the government of the United States is now an anti-slavery government, pledged to prevent the extension of slavery, and willing, as soon as possible, to destroy it. Thus the government of the whole country is devoted to the destruction of one half. A social agitation in one section has secured the political organization of the whole, for the destruction of the social system of the other. Is this the object of government? We had thought it was to secure protection to property, life and right; that its great end was to give repose. The first sentence of the constitution taught us that its design was "to insure domestic tranquillity." Is it insured? Can any Southern man say it is? Let us spare ourselves the mockery of attempting an answer. Then the government has failed in its objects; it has been strained from its original direction, and now threatens with its forces the very point it was intended to defend. Republican doctrine teaches, as the fundamental truth of political organization, that when government fails of its proper designs it may and should be changed. We have learned this from the lips of every statesman whose name is venerated by freemen, from the blood of every martyr who has suffered for his country. Any other doctrine is that of passive resistance, as preached under the last James who sat upon the throne of Great Britain. It has been relinquished in England; has it been abandoned here? Passive resistance, extensively asserted, emboldened James to acts which subverted his power: the submissionists of that reign originated a revolution. Is there likely to be no parallel in these days, and upon this continent? Practically, every State in the Union has acted up to the theory of our institutions, and, at some



time or other, made radical changes in the organic law which constitutes its being.

For the South, the government has failed. Its financial power is erected upon us and directed against us: the South furnishes the means, and the North receives the expenditures. This truth has been so often and so fully demonstrated, that it may now be used axiomatically. We suffer all the evils of a costly consolidated government, without its advantages. In most other places where there is a favoured class, to whose advantage the financial operations of the State are directed, their residence is upon the same area with those who contribute the funds for the support of the State. Hence, the latter have the advantage of the disbursement and expenditure of the former, and what is wrested from them by the exaction of government, is, in some measure, returned. Burdens, of great apparent weight, are thus supported with surprising ease, because there is, as it were, a reaction of pressure, which aids their support. This advantage does not exist in our case. The expenditures are at a distance from us, and no return, of any kind, is made, to compensate for our loss. Nothing but the elastic power of the South, its vast producing ability, and the value of its staples, has prevented its utter impoverishment, under the ruinous system to which it has been submitted.

But the mere failure of government, although sufficiently alarming, is but negative. We are in the far worse position, of finding in it a positive antagonist. We are now a people who look fearfully upon their own government, as their worst enemy, and find danger where they should have every right to seek protection. This is the worst of conditions for a people. Foreign aggression unites them firmly in the bond of nationality, external pressure compacts and strengthens them, in war there is so much that is ennobling, everything tends to rouse the spirit of a people, and, with resource and determination, they are invincible. In domestic oppression this is all reversed: the energies droop, the spirit is broken, and the fabric of society, which could have withstood any storm unshaken, gives way, finally, to the insidious underminings of secret decay. Is this to be our fate?

Recklessness of the cardinal principles of a republican government, utter oblivion of the foundation of our own system, have, it seems to us, brought the Union to the

brink of destruction, and the fatal blow to the Union will have been given, because it is believed there can be no disunion. Gen. Cass stood as the personification of those who will have contributed to its ruin, when, with the shortness of political foresight which he has all his life evinced, he ventured the encouraging assertion, that "the Union is stronger than slavery." Yet, it cannot be disguised, that a large, active, intelligent and growing party look to disunion as the only successful remedy to anti-slavery. If the Union be not the sole exception to all human designs, there is, somewhere, a cause of sufficient power for its disruption. Let us examine what must be the nature of a question, to threaten its continuance. In the first place, it must evidently be of a sectional character, arraying one section against another, by certain decisive marks. It must be a *social question*—a mere political cause will not be enough. Political questions perpetually shift their ground, so as, at different times, to enlist or dissatisfy different sections, and seldom leave much trace of permanent distinction. Parties change their principles, yet retain their names, and frequently adopt new names, whilst adhering to their old principles. Politicians, too, have great control over political questions, and mere politicians will always be in favour of a continuance of the Union. The vast patronage of the general government, the brilliant prizes it offers to shining ability or unscrupulous traffic, the large scale upon which a federal politician acts, and the power he enjoys, are rewards too great for ambition to despise. The timorous and faint-hearted, looking only to the great resources of the government, seek to secure what they can for themselves, and leave others to the mercy of Providence. Hence the effort of Southern politicians to make, even of slavery, a mere political question, and their readiness to abandon the South, upon the pettiest excuses. Hence the lofty cry of indignation, gradually subsiding into the whine of pitiful remonstrance, and swelling again into the shout of hack-nied adulation, for the self-same oppression. Social, and not political basis only, can be the basis of agitation for such purpose. If social and political differences co-exist, of course the causes become more strong. Besides these, the question must be so essential, as, in its final development, to enlist all within the contending sections.

Does slavery, as a contested question, combine these

requisites? It does. It is sectional; it is social; it has made a social basis the test of political ascendancy—so far it supplies the requisites. In addition to these, it involves a question of race. To the South it stands in this relation: shall the African be made the equal of the Caucasian? Let the last above named test be applied, will it, in its final development, unite each section upon itself? The North has given a unanimous response. Let the South consider, but for a moment, the ultimate object, EMANCIPATION, and make its reply.

We have rapidly traced the course of the events we have under consideration down to the present time, and we find that, at this moment, the South has lost every point she has demanded, and that the arrangement recently made, under the name of a compromise, has refused all she sought, and taken from her much that was not before assaulted. What is her future prospect? "Shorn of her beams," as she is, will she be permitted to shine on, without a further diminution of the feeble illumination to which she has been reduced? Has she any security for the future? She has none—none, save in the limit which adverse power may see fit to impose upon itself. So far as the government is concerned, this is all she may hope for. No legal assurances of future security are to be found in the constitution, or in what, by the delusive cant of the day, is termed the compromise. There is safety in neither. Is it in the compromise? (We use the term, although we abhor the deception which has led to such abuse of language.) Why, that affects to settle only the question of the day: it gives no promises for the future—it assumes to give none—it could give none. It is the creation of a present majority, which could not bind its successors. What fatuity to rely upon a compact which disregards the constitution. The constitution is itself the highest of compromises, and *a compromise with guarantees*. Yet, when this has been set aside, and guarantee destroyed, we are expected to rely upon an arrangement without pledges, and in the face, too, of full notice that it is to serve only a temporary purpose—that it is but a halting place on the road to unlimited power. What has been the fate of other compromises? Has the Missouri compromise been observed? Its great originator, Mr. Clay, has been foremost in its destruction. Was the tariff of 1833 retained? Mr. Clay has given us the history of its repeal

In one of his speeches, during the last session of Congress, he said that as the period approached when the rate of duties was to become permanently low, he himself urged upon the Van Buren administration a movement to restore the high duties. What a confession! What an unblushing avowal. Subjected to all its inconveniences, the South was to enjoy none of its advantages, and the contriver of the plan was the promoter of its destruction. After such an exhibition of faith, must we not be senseless, if we rely upon a compromise as binding. How low must we have sunk in estimation, when such a proposition is gravely tendered for our acceptance!

Will the constitution ever again protect us? Let us examine its guarantees for our institutions.

They are the Popular vote, the Presidential veto, the Senatorial balance, the Judiciary. Can one of these be relied on? The popular vote has long since passed away from us. The presidential veto, in a matter of sectional difference, goes with the popular vote, for none but one pledged to the purposes of the popular majority can hold the office. The instance we have cited, of Mr. Polk's approval of the Oregon bill, shows how powerless it is in such a contest, even when in the hands of our friends. The last, the best, the strongest guarantee, senatorial equality, has gone. The admission of California has at once, and forever, destroyed the equality between the sections, which had existed from the adoption of the constitution. Can we banish from recollection, that, by a prescribed majority, any change in that instrument can be effected. It is not, in itself, unchangeable. Within itself it has arranged the power for its change. The requisite majority is already nearly attained in the lower House. The secured majority in the Senate will enable it, at any time, to increase the balance against us up to the requisite point. New Mexico and Utah must come in as anti-slavery States. Michigan is already preparing for division; the immense expanse of California can be subdivided into any number of States, to reinforce the majority of the Senate, whilst over the door of the capital is traced, in burning characters, "No more slave States shall be admitted into this Union." This is our constitutional doom.

What of the Judiciary? What can it do? All is to be effected under form of the constitution. The Judiciary is helpless. Besides, its very construction is in the hands



of the adverse President and Senate. Whilst they are against us, what will their tool be? Thus, the balance of power no longer exists. To a statesman of pure designs and unclouded intellect, this, even if it occurred by accident, would be the cause of great concern; but when coupled with the fact that its destruction has been achieved with the intent to destroy the poise of interests, it is not only alarming—it is ominous.

Our power in the Union is at end for protection. We can add splendour to others; we can give no defence to ourselves. Compromise, guarantee, constitution, are all in the power of those leagued against us. Forbearance is all we can claim. Nay, more: the full power of the government, of which we form part, being in opposition to us, we contribute to our own debasement. Strained from the original design, our own powers are used against us. Agitation in a foreign nation would not affect us directly. When invested with the authority of our own government, its action is immediate and direct. *Were we separate governments, it would be a question only of North against South. But by action of the general government, representing both parties, and acting by a majority, it is North and South against South.* In the Union, we lend our strength and weight to crush our own selves. So far as the government is concerned, we have lost all; we have nothing. All before us is darkness, gloom, desolation.

Is there nothing for us to rely upon? no solace now? no hope for the future? Yes! apart from the government, everything. Courage, strength, resource, wealth, every thing that any people ever enjoyed, almost every thing that any nation ever desired. Let us but determine, and we are safe. The admirable pamphlet of Mr. Garnett, with which we head this article, presents, in a manner which defies contradiction, the resources and strength of the South, which, until lately, have been hidden from ourselves. We have too long taken our notions of our relative power from the North, and accepted the terms directed by our own trading politicians. The South, like a giant, has been bound down, whilst sleeping, by Lilliputians; the man-mountain is subdued by pigmies. Sedatives have been administered, whenever it would stir, and it was bid to enjoy the delusive splendours of an opiate slumber, only to awaken unnerved, imbecile, and craving

more oblivion from the dangers surrounding. This is at an end; the physicians are more than suspected; no more sleeping draughts will be taken. It will look its dangers calmly and resolutely in the face; it will stir its free limbs, and, by one effort breaking the bonds which so long have confined it, will rise, powerful, resolute and independent.

To stimulate to defence, the South has every incitement. We will not refer to her material resources, her property and production, the value of which, dependent upon her institutions, would alone rouse any people to their defence. We refer to the able essay of Mr. Garnett for information; he has so admirably stated these facts and inferences, that it would be an injustice to recapitulate them. We shall therefore confine ourselves to a more abstract view of the matter, and regard this institution in relation to ourselves, and not to others. The great question that we have to reply to, when propounded by ourselves, is this: Have we social institutions worth preserving?

This question has been often decided against us without examination, and in fact the denunciations against us are frequently based upon an assumption that we have not a social system worthy of preservation. Indeed, for a long time, even our own people were disposed to admit our inferiority in this respect, and were used to base their apology for slavery mainly upon the ground of the present impossibility of abandoning it. Nor was this a matter of surprise. Serfdom had, in the course of events, passed away from those countries of Europe with which we are most acquainted, and negro slavery had ceased to exist in many States of our continent. No other country, which had any influence over the American mind, was in a like situation with ourselves. In no other place were to be found two races, equal in number, but so entirely different in degree, inhabiting the same area. The matter had not been profoundly investigated, and the mistake had always been made, of arguing the question as if the two races, one of which was in bondage, were fully the equals, morally and intellectually, of each other. No distinction was made between African slavery and European serfdom. Hence the numberless fallacies which arose in the investigation, but which were received and promulgated as profound truths, by those who fancied

themselves masters of the subject. Received as established facts in Europe, they crossed the Atlantic, and were speedily naturalized at the North. The self-satisfaction of conscious virtue, which so often makes men thankful they are not like others, made the North cheerfully accept the conclusions, and it was with no small degree of pride that they believed in their social superiority to their brothers. Every intellectual resource was directed against the system. The statesman framed his ordinances, the orator fulminated his denunciations, and the fashionable theology of the day saw in it a complete subversion of all christian spirit. Lawyers applied to it precedents framed for entirely different subjects; jurists, led away by the general current of opinion, sustained the application; while a sentimental literature, abandoning reason and despising observation, wept over the state of the unhappy captive, of whose actual condition it carefully preserved an ignorance. Influences surrounded us, on all sides, to inculcate the leading idea, that our system was in itself wrong and injurious, criminal and impoverishing. It is always easier to permit others to think for us, than to assume the task of reasoning for ourselves; and thus many, if not most slaveholders, gradually adopted the often repeated assertion, and were wont to admit, in argument, that our system was, in all points, inferior to others, and could only be sustained on the plea of necessity. The admission was fatal to our cause; it strengthened our opponents, by conceding they were right, and weakened confidence in ourselves, by admitting we were wrong. Thanks to the energy with which these false positions were pressed upon us, we were at length driven to the necessity of investigating the subject from its very depth; we were forced to think for ourselves. Satisfied that the results of the institution were not in accordance with necessary deductions from such premises, powerful intellects were induced to retrace the line of argument, and examine carefully the grounds upon which it was based. The investigation is of comparatively recent date; but its results are of vast importance. It has effected a revolution in the intelligence of the South, which places the system upon an impregnable position. It has been examined from every point of view, and we believe that every examination has increased its value. *We are satisfied now that we are right*—right politically, industrially, socially, and above

all, religiously. In all time to come, this last, alone, will be an unfailing source of strength. The universal feeling now is, religion gives us her holy sanction; authorized by the old dispensation, in conformity with the new, as christian men, we cannot give up the institution—we dare not resign the trust of governing that race, who have been assigned to us to preserve from barbarity and paganism. It is not within our scope to exhibit the grounds of this faith; it has already been done by several; we intend only to mention the fact, which extensive conference and communication with all parts of the South authorize us to announce. We are devoutly thankful for it—its prevalence will forever make the South a nation of heroes, and, if need be, of martyrs. Heroic martyrdom has never been subdued.

In pursuing the investigation in order to decide whether, socially, our institutions are correct, it is perfectly legitimate to compare them with the institutions of other civilized nations. It would be unfair and unscientific, to attempt to contrast them with a state of imaginary perfection, exempt from all the trials and evils of human nature, and then stigmatize a country because it is not an Utopia. We shall therefore examine the social condition, as it exists elsewhere, and compare our own with it. If we shall be able to prove that the general spirit of modern civilization has always heretofore produced, and will necessarily continue to produce, certain mighty evils, from which we are freed, whilst, at the same time, we are in the enjoyment of equal benefits, we shall claim the palm for the civilization of the Southern States. We are aware that, to give an ample view of the subject from this point, would demand a volume, and not merely a portion of a review, for it would require a searching analysis of the characteristic systems of different places, at the present era. We shall, therefore, have to content ourselves with rapid generalization, and pray our kind readers to regard our reflections rather as suggestions than finished arguments.

Labour lies at the foundation of all human organization; all association and result presuppose its existence, and most of the social relations of man are determined by the mode of its organization. There is nothing earthly which so much affects the condition of man as the relation in which labour stands to capital. The peculiarity



of the present age is in the accumulation of capital in the hands of a few, and the facility with which it can be wielded, for still further increase. Other times have seen, as perhaps all time will see, immense disparity in the property of individuals; but no preceding age has witnessed the steady increase of capital, developing for itself, as it grows, the present rules of increase. Modern civilization is based upon wealth, and increase of wealth has been accompanied with luxury, refinement and power. The results have been vast. Imagination, in its most daring moods, could scarcely create wonders equal to the facts of every day life. Time and space and matter subdued, adorn the triumphs of capital, all which it has conquered by its facility of combination and use. But, whilst we survey with wonder the dazzling pageant, the wan figure of the workman startles our sight; as we listen to the boastings of the day, ever and anon comes piercingly to our ears the sharp cry of labour against capital. Then, as we more minutely examine the system in all its parts, we find the higher the civilization of the few, the deeper is the degradation of many. This is admitted and deplored, by all whose attention, of late years, has been drawn to the subject. In England, the spirit and tendency of the age are more fully shown, perhaps, than in any other country. It would give us no pleasure to recapitulate the facts bearing out these assertions. Belonging to the same family, our heart aches when we read the history of the suffering of those of our common nature. We could give statistics of the wages of her agricultural labourers, showing want and hopeless privation, of which, thank heaven, we have no idea from observation, in our Southern country, and that too, amidst the inclemencies of a rigorous climate, to which we are equally strangers. We could exhibit the condition of her factories, "those dens, according to Lord Ashley's exposure, of misery, slavery, desolation and immorality,"\* and her criminal records would supply us with materials to show that the guilt of her people keeps pace with their ignorance and destitution. How significant the name (familiar to the political economists of Europe) of "the dangerous classes!"—classes numerous and restless, full of discontent personal and social, present at all times, and

\* Letter of Charles Waterton, Esq., to the Earl St. German, March, 1846.

not diminished by what is termed general prosperity of the country. In a late number of the *Edinburgh Review*, a writer, although disposed to represent the condition of Great Britain in the most glowing colours, is obliged to admit the existence "of one unhappy class or more, of which we cannot ignore the existence." In his vigorous style, he describes them as "a race of Pariahs, whom we dare not forget, even though the statistics of trade are favourable, and bullion has accumulated in the bank."

In fact, labour and capital are antagonistic : the capitalist seeks to obtain the most labour for the least pay ; the labourer seeks the highest wages for the least exertion. Who has succeeded in the contest ? Facts and reason alike admit, that the advantage has been altogether on the side of the capitalist. Machinery has added to his other powers—for, now-a-days, the workman is only the adjunct of the machine ; care and cost and contrivance are lavished upon the latter and when they come in competition, as they constantly do, the man sinks beneath the iron. The pressure of population upon the centres of industry and wealth and luxury furnishes to capital unbounded supplies of human labour. The contest goes on unceasingly, and always to the disadvantage of the poor ; this is an inexorable law. There is no sympathy between employer and employed ; all is hostility. The man is selected, as any other tool, to do a particular work, and be as carelessly thrown aside when worn out, or a cheaper substitute is offered in his place. When one fails, hundreds crowd in to supply his place, and it best suits the interests of his employer, when the man, like any other machine which is easily replaced, is worn out with most labour in least time. Resistance to these laws is vain ; combination of labour is powerless to change them. Capital may repose, at times, inactively ; but labour cannot rest ; for the one says to the other, toil thus or—starve. With the increase of capital is the increase of power in its owner, and labour is crushed by the very accumulations it assists to rear. The tendency of the two classes is in opposite directions, and as one advances in wealth, luxury, refinement, the other sinks in poverty, want and degradation. St. James must have its St. Giles, and Union Place its Five Points. To escape the idea of these terrible evils, men take refuge in the plan of an entire change of these relations. Socialism,

in all its phases, springs from the misery necessarily engendered by the social system of which we have spoken. It is a mistake to suppose that all socialists are merely desirous of destroying proprietary institutions, in the vain hope of securing something for themselves in the general scramble, or of compelling all to a life of idleness, under pain of forfeiture of their earnings. Unquestionably, among the propagators of this philosophy, there may be vindictive and designing persons, who would rejoice only in the mischief they occasion. But there are also among them numbers of earnest, true-hearted men, whose souls languish in the presence of the misery they see daily endured by their fellows, and know there is no hope, in the present organization of the world. And this which we have sketched is the system that is so much vaunted.

This is the great problem which now occupies the attention of civilized man, and the solution of which is most imperatively demanded by humanity. Intricate formulas have often been proposed as great discoveries; but they have only served to perplex the inventor, without aiding the sufferer. So far, but one solution has been successful; it is simple and effectual; it is our own Southern system of society. *Where the labourer is capital* the problem is solved; there is no further contest; all that is conflicting gives way, and there is harmony between them. The care which, under other systems, is withdrawn from the labourer and bestowed upon capital alone, is here restored to him, if for no other reason, because he is capital. And truly everywhere, as well as with us, whenever wealth and work stand within the same area, labour is the slave of capital. When the man must sell his work, the buyer owns his labour, and he must, in the fierce struggle of competition, make the most of his purchase, unchecked by any kindly interest for the preservation and comfort of the person of the labourer. It is this deficiency in other systems which is supplied in ours, and which, running through all the relations of wealth and labour, knits them together in a kindly bond, unknown elsewhere. Personal attachment still exists among us: the reciprocal observance of rights and duties promotes it. The benefits arising from the toil of the negro are compensated by the direction of the owner, by his kindly offices in sickness, the attention which the slave receives

in age, and his freedom, at all times, from care. Even the coldness of political economy cannot repress the admiration of Mr. Mills for the "loyalty on the one hand, and chivalry on the other, principles exalted into passions," when they spring "from the relations of protector and protected." Success, on the one side then causes no abasement on the other; on the contrary, in close conjunction, the success of the master always enures to the benefit of the slave. As the one rises in the progress of civilization, he proportionally elevates the other with him, and their interests move in the same and not in adverse directions. What limit can be set to the admiration for a system which bids fair to do so much. Experience, so far, has fully proved the truth of this reasoning. With every increase in the means of the master, with every advance in his position, *pari passu* has come an addition of comfort to the slave. This fact is known to every one who is familiar with the Southern States, and gives bright promise for the future. Even now we may boast that we have the best fed, best clad, best housed, best nursed labouring population on earth.

The objection urged against slavery most frequently, should commend it to the well-wisher of his species. What more common, in an essay on political economy, than to have slavery condemned on account of its unprofitableness. As a question of philanthropy towards the slave, this should be conclusive in its favour: for it can be so only because the slave is less productive than the free labourer, or because he receives a larger share of the produce in return. Now, admitting both to be true, does it not show the happy condition of the slave? That their labour is less productive, is, in other words, to say they are not worked hard enough—a complaint, we take it, that cannot be made against the peasantry of many other countries. As to the other alternative, it is true that the slave of our Southern country receives a larger share of the product of his labour than the labourer does in any other system. Competition in the labour market enables the capitalist to fix the rate of wages at the lowest point which is barely sufficient to support life. Profits must be first made, and wages must touch that point, to swell profit. But with the slave, his maintenance in health and comfort, must be the first consideration of the master, and there is no strife among his slaves, as to who can live



upon the least. For a technical and narrow political economy, which confines itself to the sole consideration of the accumulation of wealth, the objection alluded to would doubtless have weight; but in the enlarged and noble social science, (of which political economy, properly viewed, is only a branch,) which regards man, as well as wealth, it has no force.

Present now to an Economist the condition of a people growing rapidly in numbers and wealth, possessed of boundless resources, with no pauperism, the comfort of labour increasing, *pari passu*, with the increase of capital and progress of refinement. Do not name to him any particular spot as having these attributes, and, whilst it would fill his largest ideal of a nation, he would still deny its possible existence. Yet this is the condition of our own home—THIS IS THE SOUTH!

We have not attempted a comparison of our actual condition with those improved societies which it is now frequently proposed to establish. The matters we have attempted to discuss are of immense practical import to us, and need not be considered with relation to any conditions which have practically no existence. With regard to those actually existing elsewhere, we may be allowed to strengthen ourselves by the authority of Mr. Mill, the last and one of the clearest writers on political economy. His chapter on the "probable future of the labouring classes" gives us plainly to understand that the present free labour system is a failure. He does not think those classes will be content with the condition of labouring for wages, as their ultimate state. They will no longer be willing "to work at the bidding and for the profit of another, without any interest in the work—the price of their labour being adjusted by hostile competition, one side demanding as much and the other paying as little as possible." The remedy for present evils he is unable to discover plainly; but it certainly looks towards a kind of socialism, although he expressly disclaims that. Is it not then most strange, that we should often be advised to give up our own stable and fixed institutions, to adopt those which need so much modification? We commend the chapter of Mr. Mills to all those who may wish to trace the matter farther.

The contrast we have drawn of our social state, with its opposite, will hold good with regard to any country

where the competitive system of free labour is actually at work. Hence, we believe the North has problems yet to solve, of fearful magnitude. The same causes to which we have referred are at work within her borders, and every boasted increase of her numbers and wealth accelerates the velocity with which she is rushing to the point where the solution must be worked out. So far, she has escaped the extreme pressure of the question, by the favourable action of the government, and the abundance and cheapness of land. With these advantages, the signs of the times are threatening; poverty and crime are fearfully on the increase; law falls daily into contempt; constitutions are the sport of the populace; mobs redress injuries, in their usual prompt and undistinguishing manner; "strikes" are the habit of labourers; the line of demarcation is broadly drawn between rich and poor, and the mutual hatred of the two classes is strikingly apparent. When land becomes scarce, and their pent up population has no vent, then the evil will be upon them in full force. It is idle to rely absolutely upon our political institutions; they were adapted to a state of social ease, and have never been tested under the conditions of social disturbance. The North has tried many political experiments; but, as yet, she has solved no great social problem. The contest between toil and riches will not be prevented by universal suffrage, and giving the election of all officers to the people. Really, in the larger cities, it would seem as if the political arrangements were, even at present, in opposition to social order. It may be objected to us, that our position, pursuits and circumstances guard us from many of these evils. Granted! What then? That we should be profoundly grateful for the favours bestowed upon us; that we should sedulously cherish and preserve our happy position, which shields us from those ills which have baffled the wisdom of all who have as yet encountered them.

Looking upon the face of the extended South, we see every reason for gratulation and pride. Nature has favoured her with soil, climate and position. Ocean and gulf and river, swamp and plain and mountain, diversify her productions and facilitate their exchanges. Her resources, almost beyond calculation in value, are mainly derived from those articles which enter into the commerce of the world, and for which the world is largely depend-

ant upon her. Her territory is so well situated, that all her resources may be readily concentrated at given points. Geography is all in her favour. In her social arrangements she is equally happy. When released from the thralldom of an oppressive government, wealth will abound through her borders and content dwell with her people. The different races live together in harmony and peace, because they observe the order of nature in their relations. The one suited to a tropical climate, capable of muscular labour, unfitted for intelligent direction; the other a higher race, active, intelligent, directing, governing—both move on together, in their prescribed spheres, in harmonious unison. Her system obeys and displays the great law of nature—series, gradation, order.

With wealth and happiness, peace and prosperity, as the natural results of her physical and moral condition, will she permit interference with her institutions? With intelligence to perceive, and power to repel aggression, will she longer permit usurpation upon her rights? It is true that she has been beguiled, by fraud and falsehood, into an oblivion of her might and disregard of her dangers. In this noble simplicity, strongly resembling the antique character, her people have been too ready to believe the disclaimers of those who sought to do them evil, and have relied confidingly upon professions of friendship. But now, that the hollowness of profession is evident, that the design of evil is unmasked, if the South shall still repose confidence, or refuse its power in aid of its own preservation, why, let the shorn and blinded giant toil on forever, in the prison house of the Philistines—a meet reward for delight in the blandishments of political Delilahs. But the blessings we enjoy, and the horrors which must ensue from any disturbance of our social system, are both too apparent to permit the idea of Southern submission. We know too well the unfitness of our slaves for freedom, to entertain the idea of their attaining it. We feel the kindly relations which exist now; but know too well the terrible antagonism which would prevail, if any attempt were made to subvert the settled order of nature, to efface distinctions which she has nicely established, and proclaim equality where she has marked inferiority. History has no page so terrible as the one on which would be written the account of the conflict between the two races on our area.

Peace and order would be changed for havoc and desolation, and no human eye can foresee when we would emerge, from the whirling chaos of discord, confusion, ruin. And this would be the substitute for our present refined and humane civilization—the condition of Hayti and Jamaica is to be given us, in exchange for that of Georgia and Carolina. Caucasian refinement is to give way to African barbarism.

Finally, then, in its ultimate development, the great question to be put to ourselves, of the South, is this:—  
 HAVE WE A CIVILIZATION WORTH PRESERVING? Ay, that we have!—a civilization to be sustained, to be expanded, to be *fought for*, in every arena in which men can contend: in the political, the moral, and, if need be, in every other field where contest may be offered. We have no choice. Ruin is on one side; all that is noble in patriotism, all that is endearing in home, excite us on the other. The strong incitement of interest, the natural pride of race, the sanction of religion, reason and justice and humanity are with us, and who dare falter with their support? Will we yield our present pride of place, our noble prospect for the future, to the bidding of prejudice and ignorance? If we are true to ourselves, the noblest of destinies is ours. Our ample area will be filled with a civilization, marked by a stability which will excite the wonder and admiration of the world. If, as it is often asserted, it should prove that the career of the American race is to sweep over the whole continent, it must spread towards the tropics by the energies of the South and the expansion of their institutions. No pressure of the black population would ever then threaten us with its evils, for the slaveholder would make his patriarchal migration downwards to the tropics, and civilization be established on the banks of the mighty Amazon and Orinoco, by the same institutions which wrested the fertile Delta of the Mississippi from its primitive wildness. The struggle in which we must engage is not without precedent. Civilization has, in the Eastern world, more than once had to encounter the shocks of its opposite. When Christendom fought against the Turk, and, on the confines of Austria, stayed the sweeping torrent which bore, uplifted, the crescent above its waves, their contest was like ours. Christianity struggled against Mahomedanism; it is ours to sustain civilization against Africanism.



## ART. VII.—WRITINGS OF PROFESSOR FRANCIS.

1. *An Address* delivered before the Horticultural Society, at their anniversary on the eighth of September, 1829. New-York: 1830.
2. *An Address* delivered on the anniversary of the Philolexian Society of Columbia College, May 15th, 1831. New-York.
3. *Letter on the Cholera Asphyxia, now prevailing in the city of New-York*, addressed to James Bond, M.D., Chairman of the Medical Board, Savannah. New-York: 1832.
4. *Observations on the Mineral Waters of Avon, Livingston Co., New-York.* 1831.
5. *Discourse* delivered upon the opening of the new hall of the New-York Lyceum of Natural History. New-York: 1841.
6. *Anniversary Discourse before the New-York Academy of Medicine*, delivered in the Broadway Tabernacle, Nov. 10th. 1847.
7. *Inaugural Address before Academy of Medicine, Feb. 2, 1848*; by JOHN W. FRANCIS, M.D.
8. *Address of JOHN W. FRANCIS, M.D., to the President elect, Valentine Motte.* 1849.

In the present paper, we propose very briefly [much to our disinclination, as the subject is worthy of very full and elaborate treatment,] to exhibit the character and writings of one of the most distinguished professional men and miscellaneous writers, the North can point to—Dr. J. W. Francis, of the city of New-York—who is undoubtedly known most favorably to the scientific gentlemen of our section, but hardly as much so to the great body of our readers and literateurs.

As our space is limited, we must be, of necessity, concise, which succinctness may be gained at the expense of minute detail. Perhaps no where throughout these United States, is there to be found one, who unites so many various characters as Dr. Francis; whether we look upon him in the light of a highly scientific and skilful physician; a general polite scholar; a lover of the whole family of the arts; an acute inquirer into every branch of science; an accurate and philosophical antiquary, yet fresh and lively in his sympathies with the world as it

moves; a humane, kindly, generous philanthropist; a converser full of spirit and resources, and the general friend of authors and scholars.

Dr. John W. Francis is a native of the city of New-York. In 1807, he commenced his professional course of study under the late Dr. Hosack, at that period one of the most prominent physicians in New-York, and Professor of *Materia Medica* and Botany in Columbia College. In 1809, the young medical student was graduated Bachelor of Arts from Columbia College:—receiving his degree of M.D. in 1811, from the College of Physicians and Surgeons; a distinct institution which had been established in 1807. Of this academy, Dr. Samuel Bard was the first President, and Dr. Francis the first graduate, whose name is recorded in the College Album. On this score, and in one sense, therefore, Dr. Francis, though still in the prime of life, with his faculties and talents as vigorous as those of an active and energetic man of forty, may be called the leader, and be placed at the head of the medical body of the city, if not of the State, in point of time and precedence, no less than in point of talents, skill, and learning.

From his earliest youth a severe student, and blessed with a constitution which admitted of it, he has been, through life, a hard worker in the fields of acquisition, and of practical beneficence.

Soon after he commenced the practice of his profession, he received a flattering proposition from Dr. Hosack, his eminent instructor, to accept a co-partnership with him in his practice, with which he closed. This union lasted till 1820; since which time he has been without any partner in his laborious duties.

Nearly contemporaneous with his partnership, Dr. F. was appointed lecturer on the Institutes of Medicine and the *Materia Medica*. In 1813, he was appointed Professor of *Materia Medica*, at the early age (for such a post) of twenty-three years. With characteristic generosity, he taught gratuitously, and delivered his first public course of instruction to a class of one hundred and twenty students.

About this time, he made his trip to Europe, for the purpose of adding to his own rich stores, and of bringing home all the latest improvements in his art, for the benefit of the profession and of society. He was absent but a single year; but, during that period, managed to see more,

(which was all carefully treasured up,) than most men would in a sojourn of thrice the length. He visited the great hospitals, and sat, an attentive listener, at the lectures of the celebrated professors of the day. With most of these he was intimate, and was cordially received by such men as Gregory, Brewster and Brown, in Scotland; McCartney and Sheridan, in Ireland; Denon, Cuvier and Gall, in France. Abernethy, among the most distinguished in London, the sarcastic wit and most able practitioner, welcomed him with open arms, and offered him a share of his immense practice. What higher eulogium could we present, of a young American physician!

Dr. Francis traversed England, Ireland, Scotland, France and Holland: returning home, he brought a valuable library with him, which has been greatly augmented since in extent and value.

In 1817, Dr. Francis, in connexion with his other duties, filled the chair of Medical Jurisprudence; in 1819, that of Professor of Obstetrics, in addition to his former branch of Medical Jurisprudence. So thoroughly versed is this master of his profession in all its branches, that he could turn from one department to another, with the same facility a clever surgeon can perform a variety of operations. And, as a sufficient proof of his largeness of spirit and true generosity in this single channel, [he is equally liberal in other ways, as we shall show bye and bye,] we may state that, for nearly twenty years, Dr. Francis devoted from four to six hours a day, in instruction alone, at a time, too, when he was occupied with his private and increasing practice.

With Dr. Hosack, Dr. Francis edited the American and Medical Register, and in which he wrote a great deal. This periodical reached four volumes, and was almost entirely filled with original matter. Dr. Francis edited the standard edition of Denman's Midwifery.

In conjunction with Drs. Dyckman and Beck, he edited the New-York Medical and Physical Journal, until the termination of the third volume.

It must be confessed, that our Doctor has done his full share towards paying that debt every eminent man owes to his profession. New-York has produced not only some of the ablest lawyers, but she can also boast to have given birth to some of the most admirable physicians our country can display.

In his professional character, towards his brethren of the faculty, he is liberal, frank, cordial; free from all jealousies and petty meanness; a model of conduct and courtesy. In his charities, professional and pecuniary, he is as munificent as he is unostentatious; doing constantly good by stealth, and realizing the delightful picture drawn of Garth by his affectionate friend, that prince of gentlemen and elegant writers, Sir Richard Steele, who thus addresses his friend, in the noble dedication to the Lover:

“As this is your natural bent, I cannot but congratulate to you the singular felicity that your profession is so agreeable to your temper. For what condition is more desirable, than a constant impulse to relieve the distressed, and a capacity to administer that relief? When the sick man hangs his eye on that of his physician, how pleasing must it be to administer comfort to his anguish—to raise in him the first motions of hope—to lead him into a persuasion that he shall return to the company of his friends, the care of his family, and all the blessings of being. The manner in which you practice this heavenly faculty of aiding human life, is according to the liberality of science, and demonstrates that your heart is more set upon doing good than growing rich. The pitiful artifices which empirics are guilty of to drain cash out of valetudinarians, are the abhorrence of your generous mind; and it is as common with Garth to supply indigent patients with money for food, as to receive it from wealthy ones for physic, etc.”\*

In 1820, he retired from these chairs, which he resigned at the same time, with Drs. Hosack, Motte, Mackneven, Mitchell and Post.

Since that period, Dr. Francis has been one of the busiest of practitioners—one of the most arduous among professional and general students—an indefatigable writer of the first class, on all the various subjects that have come under his pen, and prominently engaged in all the literary, artistic and social institutions of New-York city. A lover of society and conversation, he is no less a cordial host than an engaging companion. His house is the resort of artists and authors, of travellers and divines, and, indeed, of all clever and agreeable people, who can contribute aught to good conversation, or understand the art of listening.

\* We glean these facts from a very full biographical sketch of Dr. Francis, in the *Family Magazine*, quoted from the *New England Magazine*. There is a short life, too, in the *National Portrait Gallery*, etc.



For authors and literary men, the Doctor has always cherished a fondness, arising from sympathy and mutual admiration. Extensively and minutely read in polite literature, with a memory most tenacious, and yet most ready—an unerring judgment and generous feeling, for every kind of excellence—he is a true lover of literature, without cant or pretence.

He is equally fond of art and artists—an enthusiast in music, painting and the drama. His portrait has been painted by at least eight or ten of the first artists, from Leslie, [the Watteau and Jan Stien, combined, of comic design,] in London, to Elliott, perhaps the most spirited American portrait painter of the present day. A miniature by Wenzler, which we have not seen, is said to convey the most faithful resemblance. The portrait by Elliott, was done for the Art Union, at their request, of which institution Dr. Francis was the first President, and with Herring, the original projector.

Music, in all its forms, from the simplicity of the old ballads, to the rich musical art of the opera, finds a hearty admirer in the Doctor.

Of the stage, in its best days, [the race of old actors is extinct,] he was a great admirer and nice judge. From Cooke to Macready, he has had all the great actors for his patients and friends. Kean is his idol of these, the truest tragic genius since Garrick.

His anecdotes of these eminent performers elicit the attention of the most indifferent, and in the Old Knickerbocker Magazine, of New-York, we have a rich display of facts touching the career of both Cooke and Kean. His epitaph on Cooke's monument, in St. Paul's Church yard, is widely known and appreciated for its correctness:

Three kingdoms claim his birth;  
Both hemispheres pronounce his worth.

Celebrities, domestic and foreign, he cherishes with peculiar fondness; and modest merit, that blossoms into very moderate public success, finds a kind and ready friend in him. He is a member of the Ethnological Society; for years was one of the most prominent leaders of the New-York Historical Society, which he contributed greatly to establish, and which is indebted to him for many valuable gifts and great pecuniary support. We believe, from its formation, he was the chief physician of the St. Nicholas

Society, whose annual dinner he enlivens with his witty budget.

Such books as Watson's Annals, and Dunlap's Histories of the Stage and Arts of Design, owe much to him.

Mr. Poe, in an admirable sketch, a little over-colored, in his *Literati*, thus graphically paints the address and conversational powers of Dr. Francis :

"His address is the most genial that can be conceived—its bon-hommie irresistible. He speaks in a loud, clear, hearty tone, dogmatically, with his head thrown back and his chest out; never waits for an introduction to any lady; slaps a perfect stranger on the back, and calls him 'Doctor' or 'learned Theban;' pats every lady on the head, and (if she be pretty and *petite*,) designates her by some such title as 'My pocket edition of the Lives of the Saints.' His conversation proper is a sort of Roman punch, made up of tragedy, comedy, and the broadest of all possible farces. He has a natural, felicitous flow of talk, always overswelling the boundaries and sweeping every thing before it, right and left. He is very earnest, intense, emphatic; thumps the table with his fist; shocks the nerves of the ladies. His *forte*, after all, is humor, the richest conceivable,—a compound of Swift, Rabelais, and the clown in the pantomime."

The Address before the Horticultural Society is an elegant essay, giving the history of the art, and the views held respecting it, in the chief epochs of modern civilization in England, France, and this country in particular. It is full of ingenious suggestions, and is studded with vivid portraits of the great patrons of this, one of the most delightful of the fine arts, and which is constantly on the advance in this country.

The Address before the Literary Society of Columbia College is mainly devoted to a masterly biographical sketch of Chancellor Livingston, with which President Madison was so much gratified, that he wrote Dr. Francis a congratulatory letter of thanks, for this valuable contribution to American history. As this Address is now out of print, the reader will thank us for telling him that a very full extract from it, comprising the essential portion, may be read in Knapp's American Biography, which forms the 6th part of the treasury of knowledge.—[New-York: Conner & Cooke. 1833.]

The letter on the cholera, and the observations on the Avon waters, are highly valuable medical papers. The former has attracted general notice, been translated and

recommended at Havana, by the authorities. During the three seasons of cholera in New-York city—in 1832, in 1834, and in 1849—Dr. Francis was untiring, ever at his post, a devoted and faithful practitioner and philanthropist, fearless of danger to himself, though full of a noble anxiety for others, adapting his profound science with readiness, and most efficient skill, to the disease. During the yellow fever of '22, and the previous visitation of that scourge, he was indefatigable, and came very near being added to the list of the victims. What hero so bold, what soldier so daring, as the dauntless physician, full of knowledge, hope and spirit, in such a crisis? Truly did the poet exclaim, of the skilful Machaon,

“A wise physician, skill'd our wounds to heal,  
Is more than armies to the public weal.”

[*Pope's Homer's Iliad, Book xi., 636-7.*]

The sulphur springs, at Avon, have relieved many a sufferer, and many who imbibe these life-restoring waters little know to whom they are indebted for the clearest elucidation of their virtues which has been given to the public. New-York is as rich as Virginia in sulphur springs. There are three, of the very first class, at Richfield, Otsego County, some fourteen miles from Coopers-town, (of which we can speak from personal knowledge of their admirably curative effects,) at Sharon, the more fashionable resort, and at Avon.

The discourse on Natural History is worthy of a review by itself—so full, so comprehensive, and yet so compact. It is a succinct treatise, which, by a little of the arts of composition, might be readily expanded into a volume. This discourse develops an immense variety of scientific knowledge, and, for style, is deserving of very high praise, and has been, in connexion with his other addresses and biographies, justly characterized as “models of fine writing, just sufficiently tamed down by an indomitable common sense.”

The Anniversary Discourse, before the Academy of Medicine, we must select, however, as *the* work, by which those who are yet to read these fine pieces of composition, may get the general idea of the style and manner of our author. And we may here add, that, among the various collections of “Miscellanies,” “Literary Remains,” etc.,

so frequently put forth, few volumes will be more interesting than one containing a selection from the addresses, discourses, and biographical notices of Dr. Francis.

We had the pleasure of hearing this admirable oration. It was delivered before an audience of nearly four thousand persons, the majority professional and scientific, with the flower of New-York society and fashion. About as large a number as obtained entrance into the Tabernacle were obliged to leave, for want of space to accommodate them, and the fact deserves to be recorded, that no scientific discourse has ever collected so large an audience, or commanded such profound attention, in New-York city—a discourse of over one hundred printed pages, and occupying over two hours in the delivery, that could so fix the attention of such an assemblage, must have had rare merits. It is, indeed, an encyclopedic resumé of the present state of the art, in all of its departments, of each of which, from long study and wide practice, the orator was master; comprehensive and yet concise, richly freighted with learning, strong sense and broad views, in its historical portion, while its biographical reminiscences were full of life and spirit. In its latter half, it contains a gallery of medical portraits, of the great lights of the profession, now extinct.

The New-York feeling of the author comes up, at times, most agreeably. Dr. Francis, a true Knickerbocker, watches with pride the progress of New-York city. Full as well as any writer he referred to, on this ground, did he devote himself to it; he could accumulate a mass of information, antiquarian and statistical, as well as picturesque and humorous, that would give the slanderers of New-York pain, and show the New-England braggarts that she had a distinct character and claims of her own, not to be set aside. Of much of the discourse, only a professional reader can justly appreciate the thoroughness and accuracy. But there are portions all must admire. Here is a passage to which all true New-Yorkers must cordially respond:

“To speak of New-York in adequate terms is not my design, and is beyond my reach; her physical attributes have in part been unfolded by the able men who, under government authority, have completed her geological survey. Her humorous chronicle has been already written, by the classic pen of Irving; let us hope that



the graphic ability which has recorded the martyrdom of Leisler\* will yet elaborate the serious history of this great member of the American confederacy. She, however, is known to every enlightened mind, by the vastness of her resources, her mighty rivers and inland seas, her prolific soil, her rich mineralogy, her salt springs. There is but one Niagara, and she claims it; and her splendour is not lessened when the ethnologist, like Morton or Pritchard, contemplates her aborigines, the Iroquois, those Romans of the West, and studies the physical and mental characteristics of the Seneca orator, Red Jacket, the great purpose of whose life was to sustain and preserve the habits, the religion, and devotion to country, of his warlike tribe. I am constrained to declare, that the recollections which I cherish for the memory of the great Indian orator are blended with the delectable associations which I retain of my intimacy with him, at different periods of his advanced life. Mr. Jefferson has memorialized the Mingo chief, Logan, the daily theme of the school-boy's recital. Red Jacket may be venerated with equal justice; and if man be the crowning work of his Maker, then may the eulogium of the French nobleman be reconciled with our best reasoning faculties, who affirmed that Red Jacket was a greater wonder than the falls of the mighty cataract near his residence.

"In the city we now occupy have originated those springs of action which stamp an historical renown on our people; beneficial to the race at large, and enduring through all time. We can neither recount the sufferings of settlement, nor the horrors of Indian warfare; we are forbid the details of colonial dependency, and the declaration of rights inherent in human nature; but we would not omit to state, that in New-York the liberty of the press was first vindicated among the colonies, by the trial of John Peter Zenger, in 1735; that the memorable Congress on the stamp act was first held in this city, in 1765; that no State spent more treasures, of money and blood, in the conflict for independence; that the glorious constitution of the United States was here vindicated by Hamilton, and Jay, and Madison, and first carried into operation under the presidency of Washington, inaugurated as chief magistrate of the republic in this city, by the renowned Chancellor Livingston, who had previously acted, with Franklin and Jefferson, as one of the committee to draft the Declaration of Independence. At an early date, our Dutch forefathers established schools for classical, as well as common education, and Van Hoboken seems to have been prominent among our first teachers; and if Columbia College was not so prompt in its formation as Harvard and Yale, it must be borne in recollection that our venerable institution is still with us—that her annals enrol many distinguished sons, in law, literature and divinity,

\* Life of Leisler, by Charles F. Hoffman, Esq., in Sparks' Series of American Biography.

alumni who, amid the responsible cares of worldly strife, often revert with pleasure to the days of their collegiate association; though, alas! their alma mater appears to be often too tardy in designating their bright career in professional life by the insignia of her higher academic rewards. In extenuation for defects, which an impartial historian might record concerning the earlier period of our progress, let the fact be ever cherished, that the tyranny of James II. exercised a benumbing influence on knowledge, by his long prohibition of printing among us, until 1693, when Bradford gave us the first book on our laws from a New-York press; and, let it ever be imprinted on our hearts, as patriots, that New-York's fealty to the Union, in days of greatest prosperity, and in hours of saddest trial, has never for a moment been questioned.

"Let it not be said that, in this delineation, I enlarge beyond the proper limits. We group these facts as interesting reminiscences; as citizens of this place, we at this day reap advantages from these occurrences, and gratitude inspires us in the recital. They are, moreover, circumstances which, in their several combinations, have exercised a dominant influence on the political, religious and moral features of the inhabitants among whom we have our being. And what a host of names crowd upon the memory, in recalling the great minds who have adorned our annals, political and intellectual! Can a native of New-York forget that George Clinton and Philip Schuyler were among the heroic sons of the war of the revolution; that Alexander Hamilton and John Jay were united with Madison, as the expositors of the glorious Constitution, which binds together twenty millions of freemen; that New-York, as one of the old thirteen States, first projected that scheme of finance and revenue, which has rendered all subsequent labour in that branch of fiscal device the mere study of an alphabet; that her delegated wisdom, in the Senate of the United States, has been represented by Gouverneur Morris, Rufus King, and De Witt Clinton; that our school-fund system, for the diffusion of public knowledge, has secured an annual appropriation of nearly one million of dollars, among the people of a single State, to rear up the moral and intellectual edifice of the nation; that here, on the waters which lave our shores, Fulton exhibited the first successful illustration of navigation by steam, an experiment which, it is truly said, has annihilated time and space, and brought within familiar communication remote nations; that, in the great work of internal improvement, New-York takes precedence, and exhibits the proud triumph of entire success, having, amidst difficulties the most appalling, opened new regions to commercial intercourse, in her canal policy, effectively brought into practical operation by her dauntless son, De Witt Clinton? The military events of the last two years have also fixed upon our State the grateful regards of the whole nation. In defiance of the

strong political prejudices which existed, the recent brilliant results of American tactics have demonstrated the vast utility of the noble institution which originated in the wise foresight of Washington.

“And in connection with circumstances which so strongly mark our position, let us not pass silently by that grand sanatory achievement, which scatters through the multitudinous dwellings of this great metropolis an abundant supply of that pure and crystal element, which is at once the natural safeguard from infection, and the most refreshing and healthful of nature’s gifts. The fragmentary arches which rise at intervals, venerable and ivy-clad, along the Roman Campagna, far-reaching as they are, span a level or slightly-undulating country. The Croton aqueduct winds beneath lofty hills, tunnelled for its channel, and impends over deep ravines, filled up to sustain its noble masonry, for a length of nearly fifty miles, to gush at last, in sparkling fountains, in the very heart of the city, and yield ablutionary privileges to her meanest denizen. And when these rich supplies for physical comfort and mental growth are required no more, the woodland eminence of Long Island, our beautiful Greenwood, offers a resting-place, beneath the variegated foliage, amid countless monuments, that commemorate, by their chaste architecture and eloquent inscriptions, the endearing renown of genius and virtue; a Campo Santo like that of which the English poet said, “it makes one in love with death.” It gives buoyancy to the reflections of the solitaire, when pondering over the progress of improvement around us, that the Croton aqueduct and the Greenwood Cemetery owe their successful projection to native genius, and have added to the catalogue of American worthies the name of Douglass.”

In the agreeable reminiscences of the Doctor, occur the following notices (among many others) of the earlier worthies of the profession:

“The direful pestilence, once called the great sickness, and now popularly denominated yellow fever, which first invaded our city in 1702, during the administration of Cornbury; which was seen and described by Colden, in 1741–2; which made its appearance, to a limited extent, in New-York, in 1791, as described by Addoms; which again re-appeared in 1795, and was recognized by the clinical acumen of John Bard as a type of febrile infection, identical with that which he had not witnessed before in this city for nearly forty years; that pestilence which has spread death and dismay often, in subsequent years, in many cities and seaport towns throughout the United States, while it has given us repeated assurances of its formidable and fatal nature, has also borne painful yet consoling evidence of the heroic devotion of the medical faculty to their high

behest. I see some of the survivors of these scenes of former days now before me ; I know at what cost they earned their experience ; I can anticipate the emotions which swell their bosoms, when, in retrospection, they number their associates who, while health officers of the port, fell victims to the fatal embrace ; and reflect that the accomplished and skilful Malachi Treat, the intellectual Ledyard, the classical William Pitt Smith, the sagacious Richard Bayley, the ingenious Benjamin De Witt, are included in the sad catalogue.

“ Where could we have found, amidst a population of the number which this city possessed, a more learned, enlightened and effective corps of professional men than that which honoured and blessed New-York at the period to which I refer ? Edward Miller, the finished scholar, of varied erudition, alike conspicuous for courteous demeanour, exact morals, active benevolence, and zeal in medical research : ‘ The silence of pain and the eye of hope,’ says Dr. Rush, ‘ which took place in his patients the moment he sat down at their bed-sides, were produced not more by their conviction of his skill than by their unlimited confidence in his sympathy and integrity.’ It is impracticable to dwell at present on his medical writings. That, in several of his pathological views, he anticipated many of the recognized doctrines now in force, admits of no disputation. He increased our renown in medical literature. Archibald Bruce is long to be remembered, for his love of natural history, his zeal as a mineralogist, as the projector of the first American Journal appropriated to that science, and the correspondent of Hatty and Jameson. Valentine Seaman claims respect, both as a man and a physician, by the excellence of his life and his untiring industry in clinical practice ; his zeal in promulgating the benefits of the vaccine discovery, amidst great opposition, was second only to that of Waterhouse ; his medical papers, on divers subjects, received the commendation of Chisholm. Nicholas Romaine’s scholastic attainments in many languages, dead and living, his broad and deep knowledge of the several departments of medical science, and commanding talents as a collegiate instructor, stamped him as one possessed of special gifts ; nor were his claims to such exalted distinction lessened, when, as first President, he delivered his discourse upon the opening of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, in November, 1807.

“ Besides these, let me concisely enumerate others. James S. Stringham, a practitioner of repute, learned in classical and professional knowledge, a curious investigator of medical doctrines, a successful professor of the then new French chemistry, and to whom belongs the signal honour of being the first teacher of legal or forensic medicine in this country—a voluntary undertaking, for which he had long prepared himself by extensive reading and reflection, from the elaborate investigations and details of Zacchias, down to the re-



cent productions of Foderé and Mahon. As the successor of Dr. Stringham in the College of Physicians and Surgeons, I may be tolerated in the remark, that he best can estimate the services of the departed professor, who has best qualified himself, by a proper devotion to that intricate and responsible branch of medical study, and has carefully compared the lucid principles which he first taught, now nearly fifty years ago, with the condition of the science as at that time unfolded by the Duncans and British writers. Stringham added to the literature of our profession by several medical papers. He was a native of New-York, and born in 1774.

“John C. Osborn, associated with the medical faculty of Columbia College, and afterwards with the College of Physicians and Surgeons, was a reader of many books, an earnest promoter of the American *materia medica*, and a clinical prescriber in the New-York Hospital. He held the pen of a keen and accomplished satirist, and published some effusions of that nature, always, I believe, anonymously. His conversational powers were lively and instructive.

“I have already recognized the Kissams as a name identified with our profession. He whom I now summon to recollection is Richard S. Kissam, alike favourably known in practical medicine and in surgery. An approved classical scholar, he, by a five years’ residence at Edinburgh, qualified himself for the active discharge of the duties in which he afterwards became so conspicuous. As a physician and surgeon, he was a blessing to this city for upwards of thirty years; as a lithotomist, he was particularly celebrated. Nearly the whole period of his career he was a surgeon of the New York Hospital. While on the continent, after his graduation, he enjoyed a personal acquaintance with Zimmermann, and seems to have fallen in love with retirement, from the study of that eminent writer’s work on Solitude. His fondness for classical pursuits never forsook him, and it was curious to observe the great surgeon, while preparations were being made for him, for an operation, to run over an ode of Horace, as a mental stimulus, for the better accomplishment of his immediate duty. Kissam was an exemplar of philanthropy.”

#### A sketch of the celebrated Dr. Mitchell:

“No allowance for the partiality of friendship, or long association, need be granted, in giving testimony, in language most emphatic, of the bright assemblage of abilities, the rare acquisitions and valuable services of the late Samuel L. Mitchell. No one among us was ever more admired for the excellencies of the heart, and the pure and single purposes of life, for devotion to the ennobling pursuits of intellect, and the advancement of our country’s honour. By birth an American, his delight was in the promotion of every species of knowledge beneficial to his countrymen, and his ambition, in all his efforts, seems to have been her independence, both in physical

and mental resources. That his labours were largely and successfully directed to these ends, the whole career of his private and public life demonstrates; and future generations, when his claims are thoroughly analyzed, will not fail to record him among those worthies who have faithfully served their country in the promotion of the useful arts, science and humanity. To a sound knowledge of the languages of ancient Greece and Rome, he added a wide acquaintance with those of modern Europe, and our Indian dialects. He was, not inaptly, designated as the Polyglot of our profession. To a scholar thus armed, no printed knowledge could be locked up. Every division of his life presents matter for study and improvement: his juvenile discipline and instruction on Long Island, with his preceptor, Dr. Latham; his medical studies and pharmaceutical displays, under the direction of Dr. Bard, of New-York; his ceaseless labours at Edinburgh, with his fellow-students, M'Intosh, Emmet and Kissam; and his argumentative disputations with the knight of the Roman eagle, John Brown, the famous projector of the Brunonian theory.

"When he returned to his native country, invested with his doctorate, it was soon understood that a young man of great and varied knowledge had arrived among us. He saw fit, however, to add to his medical and scientific acquisitions a knowledge of the profession of law, under Chief Justice Yates, by which, as he said, he was better enabled to comprehend our new constitution, and fix in his own mind an unalterable attachment to principles sacred to the rights and best interests of mankind.

"Upon his appointment as professor of chemistry, in the medical faculty of Columbia College, he first made known to his countrymen the new system of Lavoisier, and suggested several alterations in its nomenclature. This, with other evidences of originality, involved him in a controversy with the celebrated Dr. Priestly: to cope with such a combatant, on the doctrines of a science in which his opponent was a recognized discoverer, is proof sufficient of the intellectual power of the young American philosopher. Among his early chemical efforts was his analysis of the Saratoga waters, his investigations on septic acid, his disquisitions on the nature of Malaria, and his mineralogical survey of the State of New-York, the first attempt of that kind in this country. Volney availed himself largely of the knowledge it embodied. Mitchell inclined to the Wernerian hypothesis, though, in later life, he acknowledged the volcanic theory received support from many important physical phenomena in his own country. He, for many years, was the professor of natural history in the College of Physicians and Surgeons; and the wide and extensive range of topics which he discussed, in his lectures on mineralogy, zoology and botany, satisfied the most censorious that his claims to compass of thought, capacity of generalization, and

originality of views, were indisputable. In the Congress of the United States, both as a Representative and Senator, his public career was marked by great usefulness; he, whom many apprehended to be a mere abstract student, was found to be a man of high social qualities, gifted with enlarged ideas, and filled with researches on almost every subject of human inquiry. He wrote extensively. With Edward Miller and Elihu H. Smith, he projected the first periodical ever published in this country on medical science, the *New-York Medical Repository*; he was the principal editor of the first sixteen volumes. This journal, so honourable to the scientific condition of American medicine, was subsequently continued, with no abatement of its excellence, by the learned Dr. James R. Manley, and other eminent associates, to the completion of the twenty-third volume.

"Dr. Mitchell was the principal founder of the Lyceum of Natural history, and, for many years, its first president. He enriched its annals with many contributions, and, at his demise, bequeathed to that institution his valuable cabinet. For twenty years, he was a physician of the New-York Hospital. He was justly deemed the Nestor of medical science. His name was familiarly known in both hemispheres; while the simplicity of his spirit and the benignity of his nature endeared him to all who were so fortunate as to enjoy his personal acquaintance."

#### Of the late Dr. Hosack :

"There are several others of our departed celebrities, whom a just contemplation of our profession would urge me to introduce on this occasion, were our limits adequate. I shall close, however, these imperfect outlines of our medical predecessors, with the brief notice of one, whom it is admitted, by common consent, nurtured and improved the science in which his life was spent, the late Dr. David Hosack. Few, perhaps, could have known him better, personally and professionally, than myself. He was a native of this city, to whose reputation in the arts, and in general science, he so extensively contributed. His American education was enlarged by a close prosecution of the different branches of medical and surgical knowledge, at the University of Edinburgh, and by attendance at the hospitals and lectures of the renowned teachers in London. His range of investigation was comprehensive, and to the best acquisitions in the art of healing he added the study of mineralogy, under Schmybert, and botany and zoology, under Sir James Edward Smith. Upon his return to New-York, in 1794, he resumed, with renewed ardour, the duties of practical medicine, and, for upwards of forty years, was held in the highest estimation, as a physician of great acuteness, profound and extensive views, and enlightened therapeutical resources. In diagnosis, he was acknowledged a master mind,

and his remedial measures were such as a prompt and almost intuitive sagacity would alone suggest.

"As in clinical medicine he had no superior, so also as a professor he is justly admitted to have been without a rival. His eloquence as a teacher was of the most commanding order; the physiology of health, the pathology of disease, and the capabilities of our art, were with him the theme of richest disquisition, and the most indifferent student could not fail to have his attention riveted to the able expositions of this graphic illustrator of morbid phenomena and curative agencies. Many of his lectures contained the germ of those principles which have since budded forth in these, our own days, with renewed vigour and fullness, and are now recognized for their mighty influence in forming the minds of the medical philosopher for the adaptation of better reasoning on the intricacies of the science in its great relations. Our wide republic, at this hour, still reaps the saving advantages of his sound practical doctrines, in the number of practitioners scattered everywhere, fortified with his precious truths in the science of healing; and, sustained by the demonstrations of his skill, and the potentiality of his name, few indeed can possibly be found to swerve from the divine precepts of Hippocratic medicine, in order to adopt the fallacious novelties of the day. No individual whom it has been my good fortune to admire in the professional chair, ever inspired me with greater reverence for the wisdom he imparted and the eloquence and heartfelt earnestness with which he meted out the treasures of his cautious and copious experience. He maintained an extensive correspondence with the philosophers of both worlds, and was honoured with literary and scientific distinctions by the learned societies of every part of enlightened Europe and America."

Biography has been a favourite recreation with Dr. Francis, and to his faithful and affectionate pen we are indebted for a number of most excellent notices, and personal accounts of individuals, eminent for professional skill and learning, and for personal worth. These lives are scattered up and down several works: the *Family Magazine*, edited by Dr. Doane; the *American Medical and Philosophical Register*, edited by Drs. Hosack and Francis, Knapp's *American Biography*, etc. The lives we can now refer to distinctly, as from his pen, are those of Cadwallader Colden and his great uncle, Dr. Colden, Thomas Eddy, Drs. Mitchell, Miller, McNeven, Jones, Rush, Stringham, Williamson, the capital sketch of Bishop Berkeley, etc., etc. Medical biography is under real obligations to Dr. Francis, and, in this nice art, the portraiture of character, he undoubtedly excels.



Of his medical writings [we have noticed but two of his tracts, of general interest,] we speak on the authority of those best qualified to judge, when we give them no more than due credit for scientific accuracy, for a rich illustration of facts, for comprehensive, and often original views, and for a novel and successful application of former discoveries. Many of these have an European reputation. His medical thesis on mercury was well received at once, abroad, and his cholera pamphlet was translated into Spanish, and propagated by the authorities at Havana, during the season of the pestilence, when it was issued. At least a score of his professional articles are held in high esteem by the faculty, in Great Britain and on the continent.

Dr. Francis has, with reliable accuracy, from an intimate acquaintance with that fell disorder to which his father fell a victim, and from which he very narrowly escaped death himself, established the position of the immunity of the constitution from a second attack of yellow fever. He has written a most able paper, entitled the Anatomy of Drunkenness, the universal circulation of which would, we have no doubt, contribute in large degree to the attainment of that benevolent ideal which is the aim of the temperance societies.

At home, in one department at least, he is superior—in all the delicate diseases of females; nor is he less successful in his treatment of a variety of disorders to which the human frame and constitution are subject.

New-York, Nov. 1st, 1850.

W. A. J.

---

ART. VIII.—ELEMENTARY SKETCHES OF MORAL PHILOSOPHY.  
*Elementary Sketches of Moral Philosophy*, delivered at the Royal Institution, in the years 1804, 1805, and 1806.  
By the late Rev. SYDNEY SMITH, M. A. New-York: Harper & Brothers.

SYDNEY SMITH has long been known to us as a Divine, whose Sermons, though sensible and practical, are devoid of unction; but he is better known as founder of the Edinburgh Review, and as the author of very many of its powerful articles, in which, with force and wit, he has handled a variety of topics of political and social reform—

with sturdy strength, wrestling with able statesmen on matters of State polity—fighting against inveterate evil customs, hoary errors, bitter prejudices and soft supineness; and, succeeding, in spite of active opposition and inert sloth, to modify the severity of the penal code, and the inhumanity of the game laws; and, not deterred by the fear of dust or soot, from extending his hand in aid of the humblest, the very drudges and sweepers of British society.

Nothing can be more admirable than the great labour and love of study, which, in the early part of this century, characterized the lives of many able preachers and divines, such as Dr. Chalmers, Robert Hall and Sydney Smith—moving them to embrace, in the generous circle of their minds, diverse branches of science and knowledge; thus extending their sympathies with their fellow men, and enabling them to defend the fortress of religion herself, with the choice weapons of science wrested from the hands of “philosophers falsely so called.”

But the strong qualities in Mr. Smith’s composition, which, more than all the rest, have made his name familiar with this generation, are his pointed wit and severe ridicule;—which, however, he subdued as servants to himself, and generally to good, while he himself was never mastered by them, or felt the oppression of his strong armour.

The United States, in days long past, did not escape from having many of her youthful follies and vanities, subjected to the castigation of his critical pen; although he received at her hands afterwards an unmerited retaliation.

For this punishment, he was indebted in some measure, perhaps, to the constitution of his mind and character, which, as he somewhere states, was rather of an inquisitive and active nature, than of the pensive kind which belongs so frequently to the *poetic tribe*, who delight to bask in the soft shade of contemplation.

It seems that, in some mood of ardent enterprize and of *pecuniary flush*, he sought an investment of his resources in the foison garden of the American stocks!

But alas! The gardens of Wall-street and Pearl-street, are not the paths for the Pastor who has passed his life in quiet fields, and by the still waters! For, not many years ago, he lost much of his estate by the Pennsylvania bonds, and was stuck so deep in the *slough* of repudiation,

that nothing was left to him—except to inveigh in bitter letters, against “*those drab-coloured philanthropists.*”

But the volume before us presents Mr. Smith in a new phase, as the author of some popular Lectures on Moral Philosophy, which were delivered at the Royal Institution in the years 1804, 1806, and are now first collected and published by his widow. And, we invite all, whose early, and perhaps forced reading on this subject, frightens them from the stream of mental philosophy, the banks of which in former days they found so miry, to follow us into the pleasant ford by which the author guides us. They will here see how a good, learned and witty man, by the high aims which he proposes, by the clear terse style which he commands, and the many fields of knowledge he has conquered, is able to make hard and subtle subjects clear even to the simple, and the driest topics to sparkle with the phosphorus of his wit.

See, first, with what a pleasant grace he offers his arm to welcome you through the dim threshold, which leads to the temple of the mind.

“There is a word of dire sound and horrible import, which I would fain have kept concealed if I possibly could ; but, as this is not feasible, I shall even meet the danger at once, and get out of it as well as I can. The word, to which I allude, is that very tremendous one of *metaphysics* ; which, in a Lecture on Moral Philosophy, seems likely to produce as much alarm as the cry of fire in a crowded house, when Belvidera is left to weep by herself, and every one saves himself in the best manner he can. I must beg my audience, however, to sit quiet, till they hear what can be said in defence of metaphysics, and, in the mean time, to make use of the language which the manager would probably adopt on such an occasion—I can assure ladies and gentlemen there is not the slightest danger.”

Who is there among us, so lazy, listless and incurious, as not to wish to know something about that *machine*, familiar to each one under the name of *myself*?—what it is—what are its aims, and how to effect them ;—what are its springs of action, when they are clogged or impeded, and how to repair them ? No one, I presume, who loves himself. The chief object of this book is to acquaint us with this *machine*, and, in a familiar way, to help us in the survey and inspection.

"By the term Moral Philosophy is *popularly* understood ethical philosophy, or that science which teaches the duties of life; but Moral Philosophy, properly speaking, is contrasted to Natural Philosophy, comprehending every thing spiritual, as that comprehends every thing corporeal, and constituting the most difficult and sublime of those two divisions, under which all human knowledge must be arranged.

"In *this* sense, it aims at discovering, by the accurate analysis of his spiritual part, the system of action most agreeable to the intentions of his Maker, and most conducive to the happiness of man."

In his introductory Lecture, the author defends this science from the attacks and charges which have been made against it, and especially the serious one, that it tends to skepticism. After noticing, among its champions, and as tests of its *quality*, the illustrious names of Bacon, Locke, Hartley, and Bishops Warburton and Butler, he proceeds:

"But there is no occasion to prop up this argument by great names. The school of natural religion is the contemplation of nature: the ancient anatomist who was an atheist, was converted by the study of the human body; he thought it impossible that so many admirable contrivances should exist without an intelligent cause;—and if men can become religious from looking at an entrail or a nerve, can they be taught atheism from analyzing the structure of the human mind? Are not the affections and passions which shake the very entrails of man, and the thoughts and feelings which dart along those nerves, more indicative of a God than the vile perishing instruments themselves? Can you remember the nourishment which springs up in the breast of a mother, and forget *the feelings which spring up in her heart*? If God made the blood of man, did he not make that feeling which summons the blood to his face, and makes it the sign of guilt and of shame? You may show me a human hand, expatiate upon the singular contrivance of its sinews and bones; how admirable, how useful, for all the purposes of grasp and flexure: I will show you, in return, the mind receiving her tribute from the senses;—*comparing, reflecting, compounding, dividing, abstracting*;—the passions *soothing, aspiring, exciting*, till the whole world falls under the dominion of *man*; evincing that in his mind the Creator has reared up the noblest emblem of his wisdom and his power. The philosophy of the human mind is no school for infidelity, but it excites the warmest feelings of piety, and defends them with the soundest reason."

In the conclusion of the first Lecture, he thus declares the uses and benefits of this science.



"Of the uses of this science of Moral Philosophy, one is—the vigour and acuteness which it is apt to communicate to the faculties. The slow and cautious pace of mathematics is not fit for the rough road of life; it teaches no habits which will be of use to us when we come to march in good earnest; it will not do, when men come to real business, to be calling for axioms and definitions, and to admit nothing without full proof and perfect deduction; we must decide sometimes upon the slightest evidence, catch the faintest surmise, and get to the end of an affair, before a mathematical head could decide about its commencement. I am not comparing the general value of the two sciences, but merely their value as preparatory exercises for the mind; and there it appears to me that the science of Moral Philosophy is much better calculated to form intellectual habits useful in real life. The subtilties about mind and matter, cause and effect, perception and sensation, may be forgotten; but the power of nice discrimination, of arresting and examining the most subtle and evanescent ideas, and of striking rapidly and boldly into the faintest track of analogy, to see where it leads, and what it will produce; an emancipation from the *tyranny of words*, an undaunted intrepidity to push opinions up to their first causes:—all these virtues remain in the dexterous politician, the acute advocate, and the unerring judge.

"If it be useful to our talents and virtues to turn the mind inwardly upon itself, and to observe attentively the facts relative to our passions and faculties, this is the value and this the object of Moral Philosophy. It teaches, for the conduct of the understanding, a variety of delicate rules, which can result only from such sort of meditation; and it gradually subjects the most impetuous feelings to patient examination and wise control; it inures the youthful mind to intellectual difficulty and to enterprise in thinking; and makes it as keen as an eagle, and as unwearied as the wing of an angel. In looking round the region of spirit, from the mind of the brute and the reptile, to the sublimest exertions of the human understanding, this philosophy lays deep the foundations of a fervent and grateful piety for those intellectual riches which have been dealt out to us with no scanty measure. With sensation alone, we might have possessed the earth, as it is possessed by the lowest order of beings; but we have talents which bend all the laws of nature to our service;—memory for the past, providence for the future—senses which mingle pleasure with intelligence, the surprise of novelty, the boundless energy of imagination, accuracy in comparing, and severity in judging; an original affection which binds us together in society; a swiftness to pity; a fear of shame; a love of esteem; a detestation of all that is mean, cruel and unjust. All these things Moral Philosophy observes, and observing, adores the being from whom they proceed."

As there are many of us who do not know Socrates, except by name, it may be worth while to know what our author thinks of him. He says that Socrates was not much given to subtle and refined speculations—that his morality was based upon religion—that, according to his belief, the principles of virtuous conduct, common to all mankind, are laws of God, and, for this reason, no man can depart from these principles with impunity—that happiness is to be derived, not from external possessions, but from wisdom which consists in the knowledge and practice of virtue—that a virtuous life brings pleasure, and that only the honest are happy.

“The slight sketch which I have given of his moral doctrines, contains nothing very new or very brilliant, but comprehends those moral doctrines which every person of education has been accustomed to hear from his childhood;—but two thousand years ago they were great discoveries;—two thousand years since, common sense was not invented. If Orpheus, or Linus, or any of those melodious moralists, sung, in bad verses, such advice as a grand-mama would now give to a child of six years old, he was thought to be inspired by the gods, and statues and altars were erected to his memory. In Hesiod, there is a very grave exhortation to mankind to wash their faces; and I have discovered a very strong analogy between the precepts of Pythagoras and Mrs. Trimmer:—both think that a son ought to obey his father, and both are clear that a good man is better than a bad one. Therefore, to measure aright this extraordinary man, we must remember the period at which he lived; that he was the first who called the attention of mankind from the pernicious subtleties which engaged and perplexed their wandering understandings, to the practical rules of life;—he was the great father and inventor of common sense, as Ceres was of the plough, and Bacchus of intoxication. First, he taught his cotemporaries that they did not know what they pretended to know; then he showed them that they knew nothing; then he told them what they ought to know. Lastly, to sum up the praise of Socrates, remember that two thousand years ago, while men were worshipping the stones on which they trod, and the insects which crawled beneath their feet;—two thousand years ago, with the bowl of poison in his hand, Socrates said, ‘I am persuaded that my death, which is now just coming, will conduct me into the presence of the gods, who are the most righteous governors, and into the society of just and good men; and I derive confidence from the hope that something of man remains after death; and that the condition of good men will then be much better than that of the bad.’ Soon after this he covered himself up with his cloak and expired.”

We propose to give several extracts, (not as select, for thus we should be compelled to transcribe the book,) but to show the author's mode of handling the various topics, and to stimulate the reader, as they must, to read it through for himself.

In the Lecture on "external perception," he propounds a curious question as to the resemblance of the senses to each other.

"Do all the ideas of seeing bear a resemblance to each other, and all of hearing, and so forth; or do we only conceive them to resemble each other because they enter the mind by the same channel? Is there any more resemblance in the taste of vinegar and the taste of a peach, than there is between the taste of vinegar and the sound of an Æolian Harp? I am very much inclined to think there is not; and that the only reason of supposing a resemblance is, that they affect the same organ. I believe there is a much greater analogy between those ideas of every sense, which produce a similar tone of mind, whether of excitement, or soothing, or dislike, or horror, than there is between ideas of the same sense, which stand in very different degrees of favour with the mind. The resemblance seems to be much more intimate between soft sounds, fragrant smells, smooth surfaces, pleasant tastes and refreshing colours, than between soft sounds and horrible crashes, smooth surfaces and lacerating inequalities, pleasant tastes and caustic bitterness, refreshing colour and sable gloom."

Sydney Smith, being a man of great reputed wit, may have been expected to have defined it for us, and shown the ingredients of its quality; not so. He is quite satisfied with having it—so also is he satisfied with having nerves, and knowing that they convey the intelligence of the senses, without wishing to sever them, in order to detect the delicate essence which *informs* them. He takes up all the various definitions of *wit* and *humour* given by learned men, and after objecting to all and ingeniously commenting on them, comes to the conclusion that wit is produced by those relations of ideas that produce *surprise*, and surprise only. Observe, however, he says—

"I am only defining the *causes* of a certain feeling in the mind called *wit*; I can no more define the feeling itself, than I can define the flavour of venison. We all seem to partake of one and the other with a great degree of satisfaction; but why each feeling is, what it is, and nothing else, I am sure I can not pretend to determine."

He does not seem to think that wit is an inexplicable thing that comes as rapid as lightning, and is as unattainable as beauty, but is convinced that, by an assiduous devotion to the culture of it for six hours a day, in a few months a man's friends wouldn't know him, if, (he adds,) one were so absurd as to sit down and labour to acquire it.

He mentions a story of one of Miss Hamilton's scholars, who, in reading, was so careless, that, whenever he came to the word *patriarchs*, called it *partridges*. A friend (probably the author,) told Miss H. he didn't think it carelessness in the boy, but that he was making *game* of the patriarchs.

Now, it seems to us, that the boy was only in the alphabet of his wit;—the governing letters, p. a. t. and r., being common to both words, confounded them in his mind;—but if the boy had been trained, we dare say that at eighteen years of age, he would have made a *punster* like the editor of the Boston Courier, and, in the course of time, according to Mr. Smith's theory, as good a wit as Senator Foote.

Wit, however, has been too good a friend of Sydney Smith, for him to drop it in its last extremity—so he concludes with this blessing :

“There is no more interesting spectacle than to see the effects of wit upon the different characters of men; than to observe it expanding caution, relaxing dignity, unfreezing coldness—teaching age, care and pain to smile—extorting reluctant gleams of pleasure from melancholy, and charming even the pangs of grief. It is pleasant to observe how it penetrates through the coldness and awkwardness of society, gradually bringing men nearer together, and like the combined force of wine and oil, giving every man a glad heart and a shining countenance. Genuine and innocent wit like this, is surely the *flavour of the mind*! Man could direct his ways by plain reason, and support his life by tasteless food; but God has given us wit, and flavour, and brightness, and laughter, and perfumes to enliven the days of man's pilgrimage, and to ‘charm his pained steps over the burning marle.’”

In his Lecture on the beautiful, Mr. Smith exemplifies the subject, by reciting a sonnet of Dr. Leyden's, on the Sabbath Morning;—before quoting which, we beg leave to give you a few lines from Milton, in which he rolls up the curtains of the night, and ushers a garish week-day to the world:—observe, the scene of both is laid in the country :



“Oft listening how the hounds and horn,  
 Cheerily rouse the slumbering morn;  
 From the side of some hoar hill,  
 Thro’ the high wood echoing shrill;  
 Some time walking, not unseen,  
 By hedge-row elms, on hillocks green,  
 Right against the eastern gate,  
 When the great sun begins his state,  
*Robed in flames* and amber light—  
 The clouds in thousand liveries dight.”

But hush ! it is the Sabbath !

“With silent awe I hail the sacred morn,  
 Which slowly wakes, while all the fields are still;  
 A soothing calm on every breeze is borne,  
 A graver murmur gurgles from the rill,  
 And echo answers softer from the hill,  
 And softer sings the linnet from the thorn,  
 The sky-lark warbles in a tone less shrill.  
 Hail light serene ! hail sacred Sabbath morn !  
 The rooks float silent by, in airy drove ;  
 The sun a placid yellow lustre shows ;  
 The gales that lately sighed along the grove,  
 Have hush’d their downy wings in dead repose ;  
 The hovering rack of clouds forget to move ;—  
 So smiled the day when the first morn arose ?”

In his review of the mental powers, Mr. Smith has omitted to notice the interesting one of *abstraction* ; it may be, because he thinks it to be merely compounded of severe attention and active imagination. But, be its elements what they may, there is certainly a phase, or tone of mind, in which one seems to be raised not only above the attractions of sense, but removed from the ordinary cares and interests of life ;—the soul is then so rapt, and pitched to so high a key, that it will not vibrate or respond to the sounds which agitate the common air.

Such was the power which possessed the mind of the sybil,—and such, the genius of the Limner’s art has availed to portray, and make visible to “mortal ken,” even while “this vesture of decay doth grossly close us in.” Behold it in the head of the Cumæan Sybil ! Steadfast, unglittering, her eye looks through all time, through the transparent present, and sees only the future. No marks of time past, and of consequent care, disturb that placid brow : no thought of trouble or delight, stiffens or relaxes

the Apollo-bow of her sweet lips ;—those lips stand parted in dumb beauty. Her face unutterably eloquent, speaks of nothing doing or suffering, but full of knowledge of the future, leaves us all in admiring mystery.

Magic sheets, traced with characters of a far country, lie before her, and the small hand which rests upon them, ravishing as it is, inviteth not the dalliance of the gazer's eye,—but, like a weird index, points you to fearful judgments to come.

In his Lectures on the active powers of the mind, the important doctrine of association is defined with great clearness, and expressed with irresistible force. In them he developes what he calls “the great principle of Hartley”—that all the passions are derived from pleasure and pain, guided by association. After illustrating, or rather *proving*, this principle, he vindicates it thus :

“Nor let any man imagine that the power and goodness of Providence is diminished in the estimation of man, by that philosophy which teaches that we come into the world void of all passions, and acquire them by these simple means. Is it wiser and greater to move every planet by a fresh power, or to guide them all in their spheres by the simple principle of gravity ?

“Opulence of thought and immensity of mind, are shown by producing an infinite variety of effects from one single cause. Providence did not originally implant in men a love of esteem, or a love of knowledge, but Providence implanted that *capacity* of feeling, pleasure and pain, and that *facility* of association, which as infallibly produce the love of esteem and knowledge, as if they had been original feelings of the mind.

“What was the first command ? Not ‘let there be colors,’ but ‘let there be *light* !’ And forthwith there was every variety of color. So with us ; the first mandate was not ‘let man be affected with anger and gratitude, but let man feel ;’ and then, matter, let loose upon him with all its malignities, and all its pleasures, roused up in him his good and his bad passions, and made him as he is—the best and the worst of created beings.”

After an enumeration of the *ungrateful passions*, which he traces to their source, showing them first bubbling from the spring, and afterwards rushing in their headlong course, he marks their province in the Divine economy, and shows how they are compelled to minister even to the happiness of man.

Pain, grief and resentment, with all their modifications, envy, hatred, malice, shame and fear—*these* form

“The catalogue of human miseries and pains; and it is plain why they have been added to our nature. By the miseries of the body, man is controlled within his proper sphere, and learns what manner of life it was intended he should lead; fear and suspicion are intended to guard him from harm; resentment to punish those who inflict it; and, by punishment, to deter them. By the pain of inactivity, she has driven you to exertion; by the dread of shame, to labour for esteem. \* \* Providence only impels; it makes us start up from the earth and do something; but whether that something shall be good or evil, is the arduous decision which that Providence has left to us. \* \* The dread of shame may enervate you for manly exertion, or be the vigilant guardian of purity and innocence. In a strong mind, fear grows up into cautious sagacity, grief into amiable tenderness; without the noble toil of moral education, the one is abject cowardice, the other eternal gloom; therefore, there is the good and there is the evil! Every man's destiny is in his own hands.”

In Lecture 17th, “on the faculties of animals as compared with those of men,” he stands up for man—he “thinks nobly of the soul,” and thus pleasantly broaches the subject:

“I confess I treat on this subject with some degree of apprehension and reluctance; because, I should be very sorry to do injustice to the poor brutes, who have no professors to revenge their cause by lecturing on *our* faculties; and, at the same time, I know there is a very strong anthropical party, who view all eulogiums on the brute creation with a very considerable degree of suspicion; and look upon every compliment which is paid to the ape, as high treason to the dignity of man.

“There may, perhaps, be more of rashness and ill-fated security in my opinion, than of magnanimity or liberality; but I confess I feel myself so much at my ease about the superiority of mankind,—I have such a marked and decided contempt for the understanding of every baboon I have yet seen,—I feel so sure that the blue ape without a tail, will never rival us in poetry, painting and music,—that I see no reason whatever, why justice may not be done to the few fragments of soul, and tatters of understanding, which they may really possess. I have sometimes, perhaps, felt a little uneasy at Exeter 'Change, from contrasting the monkeys with the 'prentice boys who are teasing them; but a few pages of Locke, or a few lines of Milton, have always restored me to tranquillity, and convinced me that the superiority of man had nothing to fear.”

The essays on the conduct of the understanding, are crammed with useful hints, wary warnings, and fervid exhortations to study:

"The first thing," he says, "to be done is to give the mind regular and copious supplies of food. It is no more possible for an idle man to keep together a certain stock of knowledge, than it is possible to keep together a stock of ice, exposed to a meridian sun. Every day destroys a fact, a relation, or an inference—the only way to preserve the pile is by constantly adding to it."

He next refutes that favourite idea of young men, that labour and genius are incompatible:

"The greatest natural genius cannot subsist on its own stock. The great majority of truly great men commonly pass the first half of life in the gross darkness of indigent humility—overlooked, mistaken, condemned—thinking while others slept, reading while others rioted; but strongly feeling that they would not always be kept down."

And then, when their time was come, and occasion or accident has brought them out, they burst into the light and glory of public life, rich with the spoils of time. And then do the multitude cry out, "A miracle of genius!" Yes! he is *a miracle of genius, because a miracle of labour!*

He also cautions young men against the "foppery of *universality*—of knowing all sciences and excelling in all arts." But he more strongly urges them not to rest satisfied with the study of languages and the prescribed course of college education; he would have them attend to the principles of civil policy, the practices by which nations become rich, and the rules which regulate their relations with other countries; he would awaken their minds early to such subjects as the philosophy of law, of commerce, and of political government. Especially, he would have a man to read with all his might:

"There is nothing so horrible as languid study; when you sit looking at the clock, or wishing that some one would call, and put you out of misery. The only way to read with efficacy is to read so heartily that dinner-time comes two hours before you expect it. To sit with your Livy before you, and hear the geese cackling which saved the capitol;" "this is the knowledge which gets into the system, and which a man carries about and uses like his limbs."



Mr. Burke, it is said, when he seized a book, read it as though he were never to see it again.

"The ambition of a man of parts," he continues, "should be, not to know books, but things—not to show that he has read Locke, Montesquieu and Bacon, but that he knows the subjects of which they treated. It is no more necessary to remember the different dinners and suppers which have made a man hearty, than the different books which have made him wise. Let us see the result of good food in a strong body, and the result of great reading in a full and powerful mind."

And, above all things, he advises the young to stick to nature, and never to desert their own line of talent:

"It is a prodigious point gained, to find out where one's powers lie, and what are his deficiencies."

Hear how the author pours out his own ardent yearning after knowledge:

"I solemnly declare that, but for the love of knowledge, I should consider the life of the meanest hedger and ditcher as preferable to that of the greatest and richest man here present: for the fire of our minds is like the fire which the Persians burn in their mountains—it flames night and day, and is immortal, and not to be quenched! Upon something it must act and feed—upon the pure spirit of knowledge, or upon the foul dregs of polluting passions. Therefore, when I say, in conducting your understanding, love knowledge with a great love, with a vehement love, with a love co-eval with life, what do I say but love innocence, love virtue, love purity of conduct, love that which, if you are rich and great, will sanctify the blind fortune which has made you so, and make men call it justice—love that which will comfort you, adorn you, and never quit you—which will open to you the kingdom of thought, and all the boundless regions of conception, as an asylum against the cruelty, the injustice and the pain that may be your lot in the outer world—that which will make your motives habitually great and honourable, and light up, in an instant, a thousand noble disdains at the very thought of meanness and of fraud! Therefore, if any young man here have embarked his life in pursuit of knowledge, let him go on, without doubting or fearing the event; let him not be intimidated by the cheerless beginnings of knowledge, by the darkness from which she springs, by the difficulties which hover around her, by the wretched habitations in which she dwells, by the want and sorrow which sometimes journey in her train; but let him ever follow her, as the angel that guards him, and as the genius of his life. She will bring him out at last into the light of day, and exhi-

bit him to the world, comprehensive in acquirements, fertile in resources, rich in imagination, strong in reasoning, prudent and powerful above his fellows, in all the relations and in all the offices of life."

The 26th and 27th Lectures contain an account of the origin, growth and effect of habit; that most powerful engine of man's nature, able to raise him to honour or to sink him in shame: how all-powerful must be its effect upon human happiness, linking, as it does, the past with the present, and disposing us to do again as we have done before.

"The wise toil and the true glory of life is to seize hold of the power of habit for fixing and securing virtue—for if the difficulties with which we begin were always to continue, we might all cry out with Brutus, 'I have followed thee, O virtue, as a real thing, and thou art but a name!' But the state which repays us is that habitual virtue, which makes it as natural to man to act right as to breathe; which so incorporates goodness with the system, that pure thoughts are conceived without study, and just actions performed without effort." "But, if we wish to know who is the most degraded and most wretched of human beings—if it be any object of curiosity in moral science, to gauge the dimensions of wretchedness, and to see how deep the miseries of man can reach—look for a man who has practised a vice so long that he curses it and clings to it: that he pursues it because he feels a great law of his nature driving him on towards it; but, reaching it, knows that it will gnaw his heart and tear his vitals, and make him roll in the dust with anguish. Say every thing for vice which you can say, magnify any pleasure as much as you please; but don't believe you can keep it—don't believe you have any secret for sending on quicker the sluggish blood, and for refreshing the faded nerve. Nero and Caligula, and all those who have had the vices and the riches of the world at their command, have never been able to do this. Yet you will not quit what you do not love, and you will linger on over the putrid fragments and the nauseous carrion, after the blood and the taste and the sweetness are vanished away."

The following anecdote may illustrate the silent, insidious approach and encroachments of habit: A traveller visiting Trinidad says that, as he lay, one moonlight evening, upon his bed, a vampire bat sailed, with noiseless wing, into the window. After several turns, it passed between the canopy and his person; it gradually shortened its sweep, until, at last, it hovered over him, moving

its wings with rapidity and without noise. This agitation he describes as exceedingly soothing and grateful. He could not determine the moment when the bat pitched upon his naked breast, so softly did he alight, and so incessant was the fanning of his wings when he alighted ; but was soon sensible of a slight pain, like the bite of a leech—whereupon, he grasped the bat with his hand and strangled it.

Such a vampire is habit ! Upon a first transgression, conscience pricks us not slightly, but fainter and fainter at each renewal, till now pain comes not, and sin is unseen ; but she has left behind her the fascinating form of *habit*. *She* invites us, with the blandishments of languor, warmth and recumbency, and fans our drowsy faculties with wings odourous of orange groves, till finally sleep overcomes us. Pray that it be not the sleep of death !

One chief object, in these Lectures, our author concludes, has been to show the simple and beautiful origin of the passions :

“They all take their rise from pleasure and pain. Men are born with sensibility alone. The passions are worthy of the deepest study ; they are in morals what motion is in physics : they create, preserve and animate, and, without them, all would be silence and death.” “Whatever there is of terrible, whatever there is of beautiful in human events, all that shakes the soul to and fro, and is remembered while thought and flesh cling together, all these have their origin from the passions. As it is only in storms, and when their coming waters are driven up into the air, that we catch a sight of the depths of the sea, so it is only in the season of perturbation that we have a glimpse of the real internal nature of man. It is then, only, that the might of these eruptions, shaking his frame, dissipate all the feeble coverings of opinion, and rend in pieces that cobweb veil with which fashion hides the feelings of the heart. It is then, only, that nature speaks her genuine feelings, and, as at the last night of Troy, when Venus illumined the darkness, Æneas saw the gods themselves at work, so may we, when the blaze of passion is flung upon man’s nature, mark in him the signs of a celestial origin, and tremble at the invisible agents of God !

“ ‘How charming is divine philosophy ?  
Not harsh and crabbed, as dull fools suppose,  
But musical as is Apollo’s lute,  
And a perpetual feast of nectar’d sweets,  
Where no crude surfeit reigns.’ ”

H. Y. G.

## ART. IX.—TALLULAH, AND OTHER POEMS.

*Tallulah, and other Poems.* By HENRY R. JACKSON. Savannah: John M. Cooper. 1850.

WE claim to have been among the very first, several years ago, to draw the public attention to the real poetical merits of the writer of the volume now before us. We were struck by the grace, tenderness and sweetness of the poem addressed to "My Father." It has been frequently republished in the newspapers, but will not be out of place in our pages.

## "MY FATHER.

As die the embers on the hearth,  
 And o'er the floor the shadows fall,  
 And creeps the chirping cricket forth,  
 And ticks the death watch in the wall,  
 I see a form in yonder chair,  
 That grows beneath the waning light ;—  
 There are the wan, sad features—there  
 The pallid brow and locks of white.

MY FATHER! when they laid thee down,  
 And heaped the clay upon thy breast,  
 And left thee sleeping all alone  
 Upon thy narrow couch of rest,  
 I know not why I could not weep,—  
 The soothing drops refused to roll,  
 And oh! that grief is wild and deep,  
 Which settles tearless on the soul.

But when I saw thy vacant chair,  
 Thine idle hat upon the wall,  
 Thy book—the pencilled passage where  
 Thine eye had rested last of all—  
 The tree beneath whose friendly shade  
 Thy trembling feet had wandered forth—  
 The very prints those feet had made,  
 When last they feebly trod the earth ;—

And thought, while countless ages fled,  
 Thy vacant seat would vacant stand—  
 Unworn thy hat—thy book unread—  
 Effaced thy footsteps from the sand—



And widowed in this cheerless world  
 The heart that gave its love to thee—  
 Torn like the vine whose tendrils curled  
 More closely round the falling tree ;—

Oh! Father! *then* for her and *thee*  
 Gushed *madly* forth the *scorching* tears ;  
 And oft, and long, and bitterly  
 Those *tears* have gushed in later *years* ;—  
 For, as the world grows cold around,  
 And things take on their *real* hue,  
 'Tis sad to learn that love is found  
 Alone, above the stars, with *you* !”

The reader need not be counselled in respect to the beauties of this performance. A single word may be said of its defects—for it has defects, attributable solely to the haste with which the author has sent forth the most of his productions. These occur chiefly in the last verse. We have underscored the particular words which need alteration and amendment. To employ *thee* and *you* in the same verse, or even in the same poem, is entirely inadmissible, on grammatical grounds. Of the two epithets, *madly* and *scorching*, in the same line, one is surplusage, and was only employed with reference to the measure. The word *tears*, so closely in connection with *years*, in the same line, offends the ear. The emphasis necessary to be thrown upon the word *real*, in order to perfect the rhythm, in line six, is a harshness which might have been avoided with little effort. We trust that our author will have an opportunity, in future editions, of repairing these defects, and making the poem, what it deserves to be, a favourite with every reader.

“Tallulah,” which gives its title to this volume, is the longest, but perhaps the least elaborate poem, in the collection. It is in the Spenserian stanza ; but our author fails frequently in his Alexandrines. Who can make melody of such lines as these ?”

“I climb the solemn mountains, and await the night.”

“Upon its generations, and the story lies.”

“Thoughts wonderful, emotions strange they may not speak.”

“Of silent hearths and cities, scornful of their doom.”

"And melancholy wilderness o'er all is cast."

"And vainly seeks a broader trace of that dear shore."

"Where rest the teeming millions who have peopled earth."

"Its pride heaven-reaching, its crush'd heart to ashes bow'd."

"Till page on page, innumerable, glows with light."

These are a few, but sufficient samples to show that our author mistakes the value of the Alexandrine, and that his ear is not properly attuned to its cadences. He must mend all these lines, and many more, in future editions. We find several defective lines in the body of the verse also, some of them very conspicuous. Take, for example, the opening line of the second stanza, on page 28:—

"Speak, suffering! call thy pallid sons!—"

Which lacks two syllables; a serious defect in a poem of so much real merit as *Tallulah*, and which occupies so prominent a place in the volume. We are not sure that our author has done right in taking *Tallulah* as a theme for moral and poetic meditations. His more legitimate use of the subject would have been to give a metrical form to the old Indian legend of the place. He might have made of it a highly spirited ballad-epic, in the manner of Scott, and in the free and easy octo-syllabic verse.

Mr. Jackson is much more successful in his lyrical poems. How bold and charming is his song of

#### "THE LIVE OAK.

With his gnarled old arms, and his iron form,  
Majestic in the wood,  
From age to age, in sun and storm,  
The live-oak long hath stood;  
With his stately air, that grave old tree,  
He stands like a hooded monk,  
With the gray moss waving solemnly  
From his shaggy limbs and trunk.

And the generations come and go,  
And still he stands upright,  
And he sternly looks on the wood below,  
As conscious of his might.

But a mourner sad is the hoary tree,  
A mourner sad and lone,  
And is clothed in funeral drapery  
For the long since dead and gone.

For the Indian hunter, beneath his shade,  
Has rested from the chase ;  
And he here has woo'd his dusky maid,  
The dark-eyed of her race ;  
And the tree is red with the gushing gore,  
As the wild deer panting dies ;  
But the maid is gone, and the chase is o'er,  
And the old oak hoarsely sighs.

In former days, when the battle's din  
Was loud amid the land,  
In his friendly shadow, few and thin,  
Have gathered freedom's band ;  
And the stern old oak, how proud was he  
To shelter hearts so brave !  
But they all are gone—the bold and free—  
And he moans above their grave.

And the aged oak, with his locks of gray,  
Is ripe for the sacrifice ;  
For the worm and decay, no lingering prey,  
Shall he tower towards the skies !  
He falls, he falls, to become our guard,  
The bulwark of the free,  
And his bosom of steel is proudly bared,  
To brave the raging sea !

When the battle comes, and the cannon's roar  
Booms o'er the shuddering deep,  
'Then nobly he'll bear the bold hearts o'er  
The waves, with bounding leap.  
Oh ! may those hearts be as firm and true,  
When the war-clouds gather dun,  
As the glorious oak that proudly grew  
Beneath our Southern sun."

We surely need not insist, to the reader, upon the grace, freedom, boldness and spirit of this beautiful ode. It is well worthy to be wed to music, and we trust that some of our Southern composers will act upon our suggestion to this effect. We might find some small defects in this

poem ; but our purpose is scarcely critical just now. We pass on to another of those light and graceful compositions, in which Mr. Jackson particularly excels. Here is a sweet sketch of the influences which a dreaming fancy in youth most readily acknowledges :

“ HAROUN ALRASCHID.

A dogwood tree, with berries red,  
Hung darkling o'er my woodland seat,  
And far abroad its branches spread,  
To shield me from the summer's heat,  
As, buried in that copse the while,  
'Mid scented boughs of shrubbery hid,  
I read of Crusoe's desert isle,  
And Haroun Alraschid.

The solemn oak, with foliage dusk,  
Became a palace as I read ;—  
A dome of Oriental mosque,  
The pine-tree towering overhead—  
And precious gems, and jewels rare,  
Were thickly strung the leaves amid,  
As rose bright cities in the air  
Of Haroun Alraschid.

And veiled maid, with sparkling eyes,  
And Mussulman, with stately pace,  
And genii, reaching to the skies,  
And caliphs of a royal race,  
And palaces, as of the dead,  
Within the breast of mountains hid,—  
Gleamed through the forest, as I read  
Of Haroun Alraschid.

Oh ! often since, in lonely hours,  
My heart reverts to childhood's day,  
When generous fancy scattered flowers  
So thickly o'er life's sunny way ;—  
And often to the dogwood tree—  
The shadows of the grove amid—  
I hie in thought to dream of thee,  
Great Haroun Alraschid !

How happily, in this little ballad, does the poet associate the images in his sight with those in his mind ; and



how sweetly does he assimilate the soft, graceful and voluptuous, in the aspects and influences of our own Southern clime, with the Oriental imaginings of the poetical nature.

We had marked for extract the picturesque and very sweet verses, entitled "Bonaventure by Starlight;" but find it beyond our present limits. We must content ourselves with commending it to the favour of the reader. To those who have visited this venerable and beautiful, but deserted homestead, solemn with bearded oaks, the old Druids of the ancient forest—and who, that has ever been to Savannah, will dare to say that he has not been to Bonaventure also?—our poet will recal some of his most grateful experiences. The genius of Mr. Jackson, as in the case of the true genius always, is true to home. It is in the contemplation of Georgia scenery that his fancy most delights. Her least places are to him suggestive of filial thoughts and feelings. Her great forests, her humblest farmsteads—even her old red clay hills—awaken in his heart the most dutiful sentiments, which his imagination links to the most becoming fancies. The poet is thus always the patriot; unselfishly seeking to do honour to the region of his birth, which, by the way, but seldom does him honour in return. May this be amended: for the perfect faith of a people, in its endowed and gifted men, is, after all, and before all, the great secret of national security. We must close with Mr. Jackson. But we trust not to have done with him entirely. Enough to say that, with a sweet and lively fancy, chaste and spirited, our author unites correct and appropriate thought, a pure moral, and a faculty for song, which, with proper training, will hardly shrink from comparison with the best of our lyrist.

---

## ART. VIII.—CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *A Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament.* By EDWARD ROBINSON, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Biblical Literature, in the Union Theological Seminary, New-York, author of "Biblical Researches in Palestine," etc. A new edition, revised and in great part re-written. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1850.

WE leave to others the defence of classical learning against those, who, too stolid to acquire it, or too ignorant to understand its true value, decry a study which will only cease to be pursued when art, literature and civilization shall again be merged in barbarism, and which, should such a catastrophe ever occur, from the triumph of the Utilitarians, would be the first instrument for the regeneration of intellectual advancement and refinement.

Although Dr. Robinson's work is not a contribution to *classical* literature, we hail it as a very important aid towards obviating the paradoxical absurdity of men undertaking to be the formal expositors of books whose language they cannot read. And, moreover, the labours of this accomplished scholar may produce the further benefit, of seriously suggesting the impossibility of being a competent expounder of the dialect of the New Testament, without a sufficient foundation having been laid, in a knowledge of Hebrew and classical Greek.

We cannot better express our views of the absolute importance of philology to the Divine, than in the language of Dr. Donaldson, in the preface to the second edition of his "*New Cratylus*:"

"If," says he, "it is on account of theology that the paramount importance of grammar and criticism is to be denied, I must be content to find myself in perfect agreement with those older writers, whose opinions I consider most valuable on such a subject. Luther thought that true theology was merely an application of grammar; Melancthon maintained that Scripture could not be understood theologically, unless it had been previously understood grammatically; and Scaliger said, with great truth, that ignorance of grammar was the cause of all religious differences. Without adopting the position of a modern writer, who thinks that philology includes all science except physiology, and that it is the knowledge of every thing that is already discovered, I still maintain that criticism is the regulative science of the present age, when our great business is to reconcile an increasing freedom of investigation with a proper respect for transmitted opinions—for I believe that the true scholar, alone, occupies the vantage ground, which commands a prospect of both the present and the past, and that he, alone, is entitled to rebuke

with equal severity the superstitious realism of the obstinate schoolman, and the iconoclastic violence of the impatient Utilitarian."

The influence of scientific philology upon lexicography has remarkably been manifested in the labours of Gesenius, in Hebrew, and of Passow, and Liddell, and Scott, in Greek; and the present edition of Dr. Robinson's *Lexicon* is constructed with the same enlarged views, to which modern philology has given rise.

It is a note-worthy (but very explicable) fact, that every scientific advance has been obliged to fight its way to general acceptation, against theological prejudices, the formidable weight of alleged biblical authority, and the odium of heretical suspicion. But no sooner has science established its foothold firmly and decisively, than it is found that revealed truth is as little weakened as ever, and has, on the contrary, assumed new clearness and precision, from the abandonment of false interpretation and erroneous theory, and the more exact definition of the theological and scientific spheres. Philology has experienced no exemption from this ordeal, and, perfectly well known, as it now is, that the dialect of the New Testament is not classical Greek, it almost excites a smile to look back upon the remarkable literary controversy, in which the purity of Evangelic and apostolic Greek was even fiercely discussed. Erasmus, Laurentius Valla, and other distinguished scholars of the sixteenth century, had abundantly shown the true character of the New Testament Greek; but Henry Stephens (a name not to be mentioned by lovers of Greek literature without respect, admiration and gratitude) undertook, in the preface to his edition of the New Testament, printed in 1576, to prove the desperate proposition, that the Greek of the New Testament writers was pure and classical. This awakened the special attention of the learned to the subject, and the signal for a general controversy was at length given by the publication of a work by Sebastian Pfochen, with the following title: "*Diatribæ de linguæ Græcæ Novi Testamenti puritate, ubi quam plurimis, qui vulgo finguntur, Ebraïsmis larva detrahitur, et profanos quoque ductores ita esse locutos ad oculum demonstratur.* Amstel. 1629."

Dr. Planck, speaking of this work, [in the chapter on the Hellenistic controversy, in his introduction to *Sacred Philology*,] says:—

"The warmth, evident from the very title, with which Pfochen defended, in this work, the pure Greek idiom of the New Testament, excited in Holland, as well as in Germany, many learned men to espouse the opposite side of the question. But again this roused the disposition of others to maintain what they conceived to be the truth, or else confirmed their obstinacy, so that they defended with equal earnestness the position of Pfochen. Hence a literary war arose, which continued even in our own century."

As a source of reference for our readers, who may not have Planck or other authorities at hand, we proceed to quote the whole of that part of Dr. Planck's chapter, in his Introduction to Sacred Philology, which particularly concerns the Hellenistic controversy. Immediately after the passage just quoted, he proceeds :

"In 1639, Joachin Jung published, in Germany, his *Sententiæ doctissimorum quorundam virorum, de Hellenistis et Hellenistica dialecto*, in which he proved, against Pfochen, that the Greek of the New Testament is Hellenistic. But, in the very next year, he was opposed by Jacob Grosse, at Jena, with a *Trias propositionum theologorum stilo Novi Testamenti a barbaris criminationibus vindicantium*, where he represented all defenders of the Hellenistic idiom as hateful heretics. In the same year, therefore, Daniel Wulfer wrote a vindication of them, *Innocentia Hellenistarum vindicata*. But now Grosse directed against him his *Observationes pro triade observationum, apologeticæ*; and, as the amiable and learned John Musæus, in a *Disquisitio de stilo Novi Testamenti*, which he published in 1641, did not altogether declare himself in his favour, he attacked this good man so severely, in a *Tertia defensio triados*, which came out at Hamburg, in 1641, that Musæus found himself compelled to publish, in 1642, *Vindiciæ disquisitionis de stilo Novi Testamenti*. Even this did not impose silence on Grosse, who sent into the world a fourth defence of his *Trias*, which was published at Hamburg, in 1642. At this time, also, the controversy was first agitated in Holland. Here the celebrated Daniel Heinsius had already, on several occasions, (as in his *Aristarchus sacer*, and in the preface to his *Exercitationes sacræ in Novum Testamentum*,) opposed the sentiments of Pfochen, respecting the purity of the Greek in the New Testament; but now he did so at large, and intentionally, in an express *Exercitatio de lingua Hellenistica*, which, in 1643, he published at Leyden. On the other hand, the no less celebrated Salmasius published, in reply to him, not less than three controversial works, that same year, the contents and character of which are easily recognized, from their titles. That of the first is, *Salmasii Hellenistica, sive commentarius controversium de lingua Hellenistica decidens*; of the second, *Funus linguæ Hellenisticæ, sive confutatio exercitationis de lingua Hellenistica*; and of the third, *Ossilegium linguæ Hellenisticæ, sive appendix ad confutationem*, etc. In a short time, many scholars of other countries took part in the controversy. Thomas Gataker, of England, in a *Dissertatio de stilo Novi Testamenti*, London, 1648, defended, with much warmth, the party and opinion of the Hellenists. In Switzerland, this was done principally by Samuel Werenfels, in a *Treatise de stilo Novi Testamenti*, and, among our own divines, by John Olearius, in a work *de stilo Novi Testamenti*, and by Henry Boeckler, in a treatise *de lingua*



Novi Testamenti originali. But even in Holland, after the first combatants had left the arena, the controversy was carried on by John Vorstius, as its principal conductor, in his *Philologia Sacra, de Hebraïsmis Novi Testamenti*, Leyden, 1658, to which, in 1665, he published a second part, under the title, *Commentarius de Hebraïsmis Novi Testamenti*, after Horace Vitringa had attacked the first, in a publication entitled, *Specimen annotationum ad philologiam sacram Vorstii*. In order to give posterity a correct view of the proceedings of this memorable controversy, two learned men, in the beginning of the present century, made, with great care, a collection of the most important works already cited, and of others also, which had appeared on the same subject, namely, Jacob Rheinferd, in his *Syntagma dissertationum philologico-theologicarum de stilo Novi Testamenti*, Lœwarden, 1703; and Van der Honert, in another work, which, under the same title, he published in the same year at Amsterdam. Some other learned men, as John Henry Michaelis and Blackwall, of England—the latter in his *Sacred Classics*, defended and illustrated, London, 1727, and the former in a treatise *de textu Novi Testamenti Græco*, Halæ, 1707—endeavoured to produce an accommodation, by proposing to the contending parties that the one should acknowledge the Hebraïsms by which the Greek of the New Testament was designated, and the other, notwithstanding its Hebraïsms, should allow the style of it to be considered as pure. And in this way they would gradually have approached each other, had not Christian Sigismund Georgi given new life to the controversy. This zealot for the purity of style of the Scriptures published, in 1732, *Vindiciæ Novi Testamenti ab Ebraïsmis*, in three books, against which some Leipzig scholars, as Drs. Knapp and Dressing, maintained the opinion of the Hellenists. Immediately, in 1733, a new work of Georgi made its appearance, under the title, *Hierocriticus sacer, sive de stilo Novi Testamenti*. This, also, was in three books, and in the end of the year, a second part, comprehending as many more, came out. They were answered again, by the Leipzig critics. After this, no one took up the controversy. The Hellenists maintained the superiority, and, as the further cultivation which the philology of the New Testament received proceeded, in general, upon the supposition which they had contended for, their opinion made far greater progress, in a short time, than it had previously made for ages.”

In like manner, a critical investigation of the text, and the collection of various readings from the manuscripts, was once decried as heretical and blasphemous, because it was alleged that the result must be to question the genuineness of the sacred books, and to shake all faith in the certainty and authority of the text. The history of such controversies is prophetic, to those who only choose to

see ; but those whose interest it ought to be to profit most by the instruction, lose the vantage-ground which they might otherwise possess, because history, at their hands, meets with what Dr. Arnold calls a "Cassandra-like fate"—ever to speak the truth, but never to be believed, until the event verifies the prophecy. Although it may appear to be a very obvious truism, it is nevertheless highly significant, that in all the controversies, where scientific advance has, for a time, been forced into apparent conflict with the Bible, some preconceived *theory* has ever been behind the defence of alleged simple biblical truth. It is the teaching of the Bible which is the ostensible object of defence ; but it is the theory with which that teaching has been identified, which is the real cause of the controversy. The Hellenistic controversy arose from an erroneous theory of inspiration. To one party, the *language itself* of Scripture spoke pure classical Greek so plainly, by grammar and lexicon, that it was ignorance and impiety not to perceive the simple fact. But, indeed, it was the language, not examined by the *unprejudiced* criteria of philology, and the history of the Greek tongue, but interpreted by the theory by which the philology and the historical facts were explained. At one time, we well know that the Scripture was regarded as teaching that the earth was stationary and flat. When it was said, But science may prove that the earth goes round the sun, and is spherical, the reply was ready, How can science do such an impious thing, when the express, simple language of Scripture states the facts, as explicitly as language can do. If it was suggested, in answer, that there might be misinterpretation of language, and as the facts were such as to require much scientific investigation, for their proof or disproof, it might be reasonable to wait for further information—as investigation was not yet exhausted—and, meantime, not to charge with heresy those who did not read Scripture language in the same way, and not to shut up that language to an interpretation which science might possibly overthrow—the retort was ready : appeal to the Scripture—its language, *grammatically* interpreted, is decisive. But science *did* overthrow the interpretation, and it became as impious to assert that Scripture explicitly taught the very reverse of what science had established, as it before had been to assert that science could establish any such facts. The theory received, again modified the interpretation : for it was *not* the philological grammatical meaning of Scripture which was the true issue, but a *preconceived* theory, which was identified with that meaning. It is thus that interpretations, almost diametrically opposite to the grammatical meaning of Scripture, sometimes appear to men to be actually the only simple, unperverted signification of its language, and they cannot conceive of that language meaning any thing else than the interpretation which this theory has identified with it. They are not prepared to receive, without prejudice, *what-*

ever may be the simple, grammatical meaning of Scripture ; they are not ready to accept, with equal cordiality, *whatever* (among several possible interpretations) may ultimately prove to be the actual signification of Scripture language, nor even to admit that there may truly be a different interpretation from that consecrated by prescription, and that *whatever* science proves will be undoubtedly compatible with revealed truth ; but they prescribe beforehand what interpretation philology must elicit, and what facts science must prove, in order to accord with what they regard as the teaching of Scripture, because, otherwise, there would be a startling shock, in admitting the possibility of ever modifying or abandoning some theory, which has become, in their minds, identified with the language itself of Scripture, and inwoven, perhaps, with their whole theological mode of thinking.

If, however, one can be found who comes to the study of the Scriptures without prejudiced theories, no better advice can be given to him, for the acquisition of enlightened and correct views respecting the true meaning of the text, than that which Dr. Robinson gives, in the preface to his Lexicon :

“ If I may be permitted,” says he, “ here to give to the student a recommendation, founded on the experience of many years, I would counsel him first to study the New Testament for himself, with only the help of his grammar and lexicon, giving close attention to the context and logical connection.”

Of course, the same advice is equally applicable to the Old Testament. But, in order to be able thus to study the New Testament with intelligence, something more is necessary than what a grammar and lexicon of the New Testament dialect alone can furnish. In order to prevent, we hope, even the possibility of misapprehension, we state explicitly that we have here no reference to that theological doctrine which teaches a radical moral change, the fruit of the operation of the Holy Spirit, without which the spiritual understanding of Scripture truth is sealed, whatever may be the amount and accuracy of philological attainments and intellectual culture. But we refer solely to the critical interpretation of the language of the New Testament, upon sound philological principles, when we say that something more is necessary to the interpreter than a knowledge of the grammar and vocabulary of the New Testament alone. This one might possess, and yet find himself utterly at fault in attempting, with such slender acquirement, to construe Homer, Sophocles, Demosthenes and Plato. While, on the other hand, one acquainted with classical Greek would experience no severe difficulties in reading the New Testament.

But as “ the language of the New Testament,” (to quote from Dr. R’s. preface,) “ is the later Greek language, as spoken by for-

eigners of the Hebrew stock, and applied by them to subjects on which it had never been employed by native Greek writers," it is evident that, in order to understand its idioms correctly, a knowledge of Hebrew and the later Greek (or *ἡ κοινὴ διάλεκτος*, represented by Aristotle, Polybius, Diodorus, Plutarch, Ælian, etc.,) is indispensable. It was the Aramaic colouring given to the later Greek, by the Hebrews, after the time of the Macedonian conquest, which gave rise to the peculiar dialect, known (since the time of the younger Scaliger) by the name of Hellenistic, and which is represented in the Septuagint, Philo, Josephus, (although both of these writers, being men of education, approach very nearly to the later Greek,) and in the New Testament. In accordance with this historical position of the Hellenistic dialect, Dr. Robinson has aimed, in his Lexicon, at exhibiting "each word in its true character and relations, as a component part of the Greek tongue; as compared, on the one hand, with the Hellenistic idiom, and, on the other, with the usage of classic Greek writers." And thus, by his references to the Septuagint, Philo, Josephus, to the later Greek writers, as Plutarch, etc., and also to Attic writers, where references to them are available, he not only elucidates "the meaning of a word, but also shows its authority and standing in the Greek language."

While Dr. R. has omitted (as belonging properly to a general Lexicon of the language, and, in some respects, as not compatible with the plan of a work devoted only to a subordinate phase of the Greek tongue,) the full historical development of the use and progress of words, and the exhibition of their affinities, as presented by comparative philology, he has given "the etymology of each word, so far as it appertains to the Greek and Hebrew, and occasionally to the Latin;" while his careful exhibition of the "logical" view of the words, or the order in which their significations occur in the New Testament, adds peculiar value to his labours, and his copious parallel references render the Lexicon a good concordance, for the greater part of the New Testament Scriptures.

As long as Protestant divines hold that correct theology depends, not upon ecclesiastical traditions, but upon a correct interpretation of certain books, they can regard no science of more importance than philology, of which their biblical criticism is but a branch. To Dr. Robinson, therefore, they owe especial gratitude, for having furnished them with the best Lexicon to the New Testament which has hitherto been published, constructed upon scientific principles, in some respects a commentary and concordance, and more copious in references to Hellenistic writers than Wahl, and, in references to classical writers, than Bretschneider.



2. *English Grammar*. The English Language, in its Elements and Forms, with a history of its origin and development. Designed for use in Colleges and Schools. By WM. C. FOWLER, late Professor of Rhetoric, in Amherst College. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1850.

WE can do no more than invite attention to this volume, which is an attempt to present a philosophical analysis of the English language, upon the general principles of philology, established by the great and scientific labourers in that department.

Mr. Fowler has acknowledged the ample use made by him of Dr. Latham's well-known and valuable labours, and indicates a number of the most important sections of the work as having been furnished by Prof. J. W. Gibbs, of Yale College, who is distinguished for his philological researches. In a notice like the present, it is impossible to enter upon any examination of the principles or execution of the work, and we must confine ourselves to a very brief conspectus of the contents of the volume, that our readers may judge of the extent of ground which it covers. Besides a clear and succinct account of the origin of English, and of its various elements, as the Celtic, Latin, Anglo-Saxon, etc., etc., etc., there is a philosophical examination of the phonology of the language, (embracing the nature, relations and genesis of the elementary sounds, the euphonic changes, the natural significance of articulate sounds, quantity, accent,) orthography, in its various relations, including the relation of the letters to the elementary sounds—historical sketch of the origin of the English alphabet—a complete discussion of the entire grammar of the language, with its relations to logic and rhetoric—prosody, (where, by the way, we look upon the adaptation of English rhythm to classical metres as merely fanciful,) and punctuation. Although this is a very meagre and imperfect statement of the contents of the book, it will suffice to show at what comprehensiveness the author aims. The teacher will find the work highly useful, whether employed for the higher and most intelligent classes, or used only in the closet. The student of the philosophy of his mother tongue, and the philologist, will find the volume by no means uninteresting, nor undeserving their attention, and the general reader will find in it interesting matter with regard to general principles of philology.

We observe that the author says, "Prosody, from the Greek, *προσῳδία*," [which, *en passant*, ought to have been printed *προσῳδία*,]\*

\* We do not see why, in page 18, the mis-accentuation of the two Greek words quoted (line 10) should have been allowed to stand, as it is so glaring that it at once arrests the eye.

"originally signified *accent*. It is now used in a wider sense, etc." This is inaccurate. The Greek grammarians comprised under the term every thing affecting the sound of a syllable—accents, breathings, apostrophe, hyphen, hypodistole—as well as the quantity of syllables; while we now confine the term to quantity and metre.

In connection with the study of English in its sources, we would recommend, together with this work of Mr. Fowler, (and those of Dr. Latham, which he has employed,) the publications by Dr. L. F. Klipstein, for the acquisition of the Anglo-Saxon.

3. *Lives of Eminent Literary and Scientific Men of America.* By JAMES WYMAN, M.D. New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 1850.

WE regard this volume as a very creditable beginning, of a series which we shall be pleased to see continued. There is really no deficiency of material, in this country, for a collection as extensive as that which could be gleaned from any other civilized nation, during the same period of national existence. We have been quite too much in the habit of disparaging the endowments of our people, and we shall find, upon a fair comparison with other nations, of the remarkable men whom we have produced, that, so far from there being any deficiency, there is rather an excess. That we have not learned justly to value them, may be accounted for, if not excused, by a proverb; but is really due to the provincial condition in which we have lived, and avowedly still live, in relation to Great Britain. The volume before us, devoted to five biographies only,—those of Franklin, Edwards, Fulton, Marshall, Rittenhouse and Whitney—is in proof of the justice of our claim, and of the ease with which it may be established. These biographies are written sensibly, in good and unambitious style, and with a sufficient knowledge of their subjects. They do not strike us as presenting any evidence of originality, nor is any such claim asserted; but they are comprehensive, well arranged, well put together, and afford to the general reader a sufficient idea of the persons whose career and character are delineated and discussed. One of the best prepared of these biographies is that of David Rittenhouse—a man of science, well meriting the distinction which has been accorded him in American biography. The mention of Rittenhouse enables us to publish an original letter, from the pen of this philosopher—written in 1780—which has never before been in print. It was addressed to Mr. Searle, then on his way to Europe, and exhibits the want of resource, at that day, in America, and the poverty of the mechanical arts among us. The letter is in a very neat, and even pretty style of penmanship, showing simplicity of character, a quiet and gentle temperament, and a nice sense of clearness and propriety.

*"Philadelphia, Aug. 13th, 1780.*

"DEAR SIR:—

At the time of writing this, I hope you are safely arrived at your intended port, and I most heartily wish you a happy meeting with our good friends at Paris, amongst whom you will please to give my best compliments to the worthy Dr. Franklin.

"I am sorry that I had not the pleasure of seeing you after my journey into the country, just before you sailed from this port—I should then more particularly have informed you of the great change for the better in our country affairs; an excellent harvest, industry everywhere prevailing, and comfortable accommodations for travellers, very different from the situation we were in 1778. I am the more pleased with these observations, as my constant wish has been that America may flourish under the war, not flattering myself in the least with a speedy termination of it.

"I shall be greatly obliged to you, sir, if, during your stay in Europe, you transmit to me such new publications as contain any thing curious in philosophy or the sciences, whether in the French, Dutch or English language, or any new invented curious instrument, particularly a good hygrometer, I should be glad of. Some pretty large pieces of rough glass, proper for making achromatic telescopes, will be very acceptable; but this I despair of procuring, because those who understand them will probably be disingenuous enough to send such of choice as are worth nothing—at least, this I have found true of the London artist. The expenses attending any of these things I will with pleasure pay, in such manner as you shall direct. Wishing you every happiness, I conclude, dear sir, your sincere friend, and most obedient, humble servant,

(Signed)

DAVID RITTENHOUSE.

"P.S. I will not write a word of news, as you will be fully informed by much better hands."

"MR. SEARLE."

Here follows an additional note :

"The properties of the rough pieces of glass, for making telescopes, are these: the different pieces must be of different kinds of glass—one kind of white glass, with a considerable quantity of lead in the composition; the other kind made without any lead, or other metal, and both free from veins or air-bubbles. They must be from 1-4 to 1-2 an inch in thickness—more or less."

4. *Annals of the Queens of Spain*, from the period of the conquest of the Goths down to the reign of her present Majesty, Isabel II., together with the remarkable events that occurred during their reigns, and anecdotes of their courts. By ANITA GEORGE. Vol. II. New-York: Baker & Scribner. 1850.

THE first volume of Mrs. George was necessarily of limited attraction, in consequence of the meagreness of her materials. The old chroniclers, from whom she drew her histories, made quite too little account of their female sovereigns, to put on record those domestic details, which constitute, necessarily, so large a portion of the life of the sex. Women, at large, in those early periods, barbarous, with all their state, occupied a position quite too subordinate, in society as upon the throne, to allow of her appearing in any situation which could afford subjects of national interest, or provoke, to any great degree, that of the reader. But, in the present volume, the case is otherwise. Here our author treads on certain grounds of history, and descends to a period when the sex, raised by civilization, was necessarily crowned with at least a portion of the authority and influence of her superior. The career of Isabel, the wife of Ferdinand, the Catholic, was that also of a very shrewd and sagacious princess—one of whom her subjects were proud, and who commanded the esteem of her lord in very great degree. It is her history that furnishes the material of the volume before us. In this history, Mrs. George labours under the great disadvantage of coming after a writer who has achieved very wide successes as a historian. The *Lives of Ferdinand and Isabella*, from the pen of Mr. Prescott, must naturally oppose a formidable obstacle to the success of Mrs. George. That cold, but brilliant narrative, will necessarily be assumed as occupying all the ground; while the elaborate diction, and splendid copiousness of style, which characterizes its author, will make it seem presumptuous for any less famous or well-known writer to attempt the same subject. But this will be to judge prematurely and unwisely. In the first place, though a Spanish woman by birth, Mrs. George is a writer of very excellent English—clear, compact, forcible and graceful, if not brilliant and highly artificial. She is, also, a very shrewd, sensible and correct thinker. There is another matter. The field occupied by Mr. Prescott was rather more general, more comprehensive, more national, less domestic, and wanting more in the details relating to the personal life of Isabella, than that which our author penetrates. In the discussion of great national events, and considerations involving equally the kingdoms of Castile and Leon, Mr. Prescott could afford but little space for the minor events belonging to the life of Isabella. In the narrow field which our author has taken



for her own, she saves herself from a rivalry which might have been dangerous. There is yet another matter. She takes a very different view of the character of her subject. In the brilliant pictures of Mr. Prescott, we see Isabella only as a sovereign, frequently acquiring beauty and sweetness by being put in contrast with Ferdinand, and affording a grateful relief, from this contrast, to the spectator. In the work of Mrs. George, Isabella appears chiefly as the woman, and we are thus permitted to see her imperfections also. Here, she is very far from perfect. She is shown up with her vices, as well as virtues—her faults and infirmities, as well as strength of character—shown to be sometimes more shrewd than amiable, more selfish than devoted, more bigoted than faithful or religious. But we must leave it to the reader to examine her picture for himself, and revise anew his estimate of a sovereign, who, with all her faults, was a very remarkable woman, and exercised a large influence over her country and her times. The narrative is very well written—with a nervous pen—wanting somewhat in softness—wanting in the picturesque—but always sensible, clear and vigorous. The volume is illustrated by a fine portrait of Isabella.

5. *The Foot-prints of the Creator: or the Asterolepis of Stromness.* By HUGH MILLER, author of "The Old Red Sandstone." With a memoir of the author, by LOUIS AGASSIZ. Boston: Gould, Kendall & Lincoln. 1850.

THE author of this production has received the highest commendation as a geologist, and as a writer on this branch of science, from the first authorities of the day. Mr. Lyell, Mr. Murcheson, Dr. Buckland, and last, but not least, Professor Agassiz, all testify to his equal profundity and eloquence. The latter has written his memoir, and edited the beautiful American edition before us, which it accompanies. We propose to confide the volume, accordingly, to some proper hand, for review, hereafter. It is one of too much interest and value to be dismissed in a passing paragraph. Of Hugh Miller, the writer, Agassiz gives us a very pleasing account. He is a native of Cromarty, Scotland, and descended from a humble origin. Like many other remarkable persons, he was, at school, a truant and a dunce; the schoolmaster, as is too frequently the case, being little able to distinguish the capacity, which, in the exercise of an original endowment, was already beyond that merely mechanical exercise of the memory which is so vulgarly assumed to be education. A runagate from school, he was already, when a boy, pursuing the study of nature, along the seashore and among the mountains. Here he found teachers much more thorough and persuasive than in the walls of the common school house. His alphabet was conned in the old red sandstone, and the successive strata

of earth and rock opened for him new volumes of research. He naturally became a discoverer, as well as an explorer. Geologists had taught that the old red sandstone was wanting in organic remains. Hugh Miller discovered, on the contrary, that it was richly fossiliferous. To him the discovery was due of the *Pterichthys*, or winged fish, which he introduced to the knowledge of geologists in 1838, having discovered it in 1831. His first book, "The Old Red Sandstone," develops the whole progress of his study and discovery, during the first twenty years of his life, as a man of science. His second publication was entitled, "Impressions of England and its people." It is commended as a work at once scientific, social and political, distinguished by thought, knowledge and a beautiful style. His last publication is the one before us. Of this work, for the present, we shall confine ourselves to saying briefly, from the memoir of Agassiz, that

"The author treats of the fossil geology of the Orkneys, as exhibited in the vicinity of Stromness; of the development hypothesis, and its consequences; of the history and structure of that remarkable fish, the *asterolepis*; of the fishes of the Upper and Lower Silurian rocks; of the progress of degradation, and its history; of the Lamarckian hypothesis of the origin of plants, and its consequences; of the marine and terrestrial floras; and of final causes, and their bearing on geological history. In the course of these chapters, Mr. Miller discusses the development hypothesis, or the hypothesis of natural law, as maintained by Lamarck and by the author of the *Vestiges of Creation*, and has subjected it, in its geological aspect, to the most rigorous examination. Driven, by the discoveries of Lord Rosse, from the domains of astronomy, where it once seemed to hold a plausible position, it might have lingered, with the appearance of life, among the ambiguities of the Palæozoic formations; but Mr. Miller has, with an ingenuity and patience worthy of a better subject, stripped it even of its semblance of truth, and restored to the Creator, as Governor of the universe, that power and those functions which he was supposed to have resigned at its birth."

6. *Five Years of a Hunter's Life, in the far interior of South Africa.* With notices of the native tribes and anecdotes of the chase of the lion, elephant, hippopotamus, giraffe, rhinoceros, etc. By ROUALEYN GORDON CUMMING, Esq., of Altyre. With illustrations. In two volumes. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1850.

HERE is a book to silence forever all the ordinary tribes of hunters. Reading it, one feels a thorough contempt for all the race of mere buck and buffalo slayers, and the pursuers of such "small

deer." Our prince of sportsmen, Gordon Cumming, has survived such moderate excitements. He has had his surfeit of grouse and woodcock. The red deer of his own Scottish hills and heaths no longer stimulate his enterprize. He longs for wilder sports, broader pastures, and a more terrible sort of beasts, in order to exercise his passion for adventure. Accordingly, he plunges into the deserts and wilds of Southern Africa. There he runs down a giraffe, as we run down a hare or a fox. He knocks over a bull elephant, for breakfast; poniards or pistols a hyena or rhinoceros, as coolly as we spit a partridge; and, coming suddenly upon a lion, he winds his hand into his mane, and canters off to the jungle, in pursuit of other prey. Do not understand us as speaking literally; but our hyperbole is scarcely extravagant. A sportsman so cool, ready and audacious, has never written book before. All these mighty beasts of the wilderness have been his victims—have fallen before his rifle. To rush in among a herd of elephants, while they are exercising their snouts in the overthrow of a forest—to select a pair of the largest bulls, and put thirty-five bullets into the body of each—to ensconce himself in a hole, and watch all night above the pool where the leopard and the wild dog, the rhinoceros and the lion, come to drink—to shoot them down, at his pleasure, a score a night—to dash into the river, up to his neck, and capture, with tooth and nail, the struggling and half drowning hippopotamus, which he has wounded—to meet the lion face to face, and tumble him with a shot, as felly as butcher tumbles bullock—these are the daily achievements of our hero, for many months, and these constitute the materials of his highly interesting volumes; which the reader will richly enjoy, for their life, their novelty, the wonders they describe, and the admirable spirit which they exhibit in the narrator, whose veracity there is no reason to question. We could make a hundred fearful and highly exciting extracts from these two volumes, every page of which teems with the striking, the impressive, the amusing and the interesting; but prefer commending them to the reader's own perusal.

7. *Beranger: Two hundred of his Lyrical Poems, done into English verse.* By WILLIAM YOUNG. New-York: Geo. P. Putnam. 1850.

THIS is the first English translation of Beranger, which gives us any thing like a reasonable proportion of his writings. It is also the most respectable. Mr. Young is not himself a poet, but a very clever maker of verses; and, all things considered—not forgetting the peculiar difficulty of rendering a writer like Beranger, so sly and so sarcastic, from the French into our language—he has succeeded to admiration, in the greater number of his versions. We regret that

he has not invariably followed the measure of his original. No translator should venture to depart from it. The peculiar metre which the poet employs belongs to the peculiar character of his song. Each sentiment is really conceived in verse; the verse forms the proper language of the sentiment, and the latter must lose something, where the former is departed from. This is a very important matter, the value of which has never been considered duly by translators. If verse is to be employed at all, then we should employ, as the poet himself does, that form of rhythm which accords most musically with the sentiment. It must never be forgotten that the poet *thinks* in verse, and that verse is his natural mode of expression. The verse necessarily varies with his emotions, which form the sensuous medium through which his thought shows itself, and this medium makes the poetry of the thought. We acknowledge that Mr. Young has very commonly adhered to the rhythmical forms of his original; but, with a little more painstaking, he might have kept the metre in all cases. We speak confidently on this head. In the verse of Beranger, especially, the peculiar metre is almost absolutely necessary to his peculiar fancy. We commend this very pretty volume, without reserve. The prose matter of Beranger, at the close, which is highly interesting and well rendered, should have been placed at the opening of the volume.

8. *The Paradise Lost.* By JOHN MILTON. With notes, explanation and critical. Edited by Rev. JAMES ROBERT BOYD, author of "Elements of Rhetoric," etc. New-York: Baker & Scribner. 1850.

WE may reasonably take for granted, that no necessity exists for commending to the world, at the present moment, the writings of John Milton, and the poem of *Paradise Lost*, in particular. Milton is one of the few, confessed by great masters, who sit on the topmost height of epic song, in almost unapproachable supremacy. All that remains, is to say of each edition, as it appears, it is more or less worthy of the divine poetry which it enshrines. This, before us, is one of the most beautiful that we have seen, as regards the letter press, the paper, and general style of manufacture. It is, in fact, sent forth as one of those gay, beautiful gift books, which so throng the shops at the New Year; worthy of comparison with the most beautiful of them, in all externals, and vastly superior, of course, in literary essentials. Its illustrations, we may add, are taken from those bold, picturesque delineations, of John Martin, which are generally agreed to be the noblest tributes which the sister art of painting has yet offered to Milton's poetry. We must add, that the editorship of Mr. Boyd is not the least of the recommendations of this beautiful volume. The learning of Milton occasionally needs a



commentator. It is some considerable qualification of his popularity, that his editions are so commonly without an editor. Mr. Boyd has shown his own judgment and taste to be very good, in his notes and prefaces. But he has not been content to rely upon himself purely. He has edited the various writers upon Milton, with reference to him especially, and has drawn from each, in turn, such portions of what has been written as seemed most necessary to make the author understood, and most worthy to be preserved. Sir Egerton Brydges, Addison, Newton, Todd, Stebbing, Macauley, Hume, Kitto, Richardson, Thyer, and Pearce, are thus made tributary to the work, and combine to render the present edition of the *Paradise Lost* very superior to any that has yet been seen in this country.

9. *Grahame : or Youth and Manhood*. A romance. By the author of "*Talbot and Vernon*." New-York : Baker & Scribner. 1850.

"*TALBOT AND VERNON*" was a very readable story, and so, indeed, is the work before us ; but it is, by no means, an improvement on its predecessor. It is, perhaps, not quite so clever, as a work of art, and much less meritorious, in a moral point of view. The author commits several serious blunders in his characterization. His hero is one of those fortunate persons, who win the hearts of women at a glance. The course of this story shows us three, at least, who are quite ready to die for him, at a moment's warning, or live with him, at the same short notice. But there is one serious objection to their doing so honestly and *selon les regles*. He is forbidden by his papa, on his death-bed, ever to marry, and, like a dutiful son, he obeys this order, until he has ruined one woman, whom he devotedly loves, and plays the mischief with a couple more. One he drives to sadness, another to badness, and a third to madness. The second of these he finally marries ; the first, in revenge, marries another person, and the last poor girl flings herself into the sea and perishes. The men are of assorted character—two of them, in good society, being murderers by intention, and almost so by deed ; and others bad enough to be their companions. The story is a wandering one. We are introduced to Gen. Jackson, and go through the battle of New-Orleans. We go to South America, and fight under Bolivar. In this latter progress lies the chief interest of the volume, and much of this matter is very pleasant reading. Our author need not have apologized for the liberties which he takes with the Liberator, Bolivar. The world has long since been quite satisfied that he was a dastard and a humbug—as dirty a little despot as ever shammed hero and freedom, to the discredit and the detriment of both.

10. *The Life of Silas Talbot*, a Commodore in the Navy of the United States. By HENRY T. TUCKERMAN. New-York: J. C. Riker. 1850.

COMMODORE TALBOT, descended from an English family, of high historical renown, was a native of New-England. He distinguished himself during the revolution, as well in the land as in the sea service. His skill was great, and his intrepidity unbounded. After numerous small achievements, he arrived at the command of a man-of-war. He was unfortunate, and fell into the hands of the British; was two years their captive or in exile; but returned home, finally, to receive the honours, if not the rewards, of his native country. He superintended the building of the frigate *Constitution*, and, in 1779, was her captain. He died in New-York, in 1813, highly respected by those who knew him, and with a name honourably inscribed among those who had honoured the country by their valour and conduct. Mr. Tuckerman has given us a very pleasing narrative of the career of Commodore Talbot. The style and manner of this writer are very well adapted to essays of this description, and the graceful biography before us is one that we commend with pleasure to the perusal of our readers.

11. *Heloise, or the Unrevealed Secret*. A tale. By TALVI. New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 1850.

THE shows of good taste and good sense,—talent, in short,—are considerable, in this volume. *Heloise* is a clever girl, who commits a serious error—a fault, in fact—which our author does not sufficiently rebuke. She withholds a secret, of vast importance to her own and the interests of others. She withholds, improperly as well as unwisely, a document, which is not her own, from the possession of the rightful owner. However we may find excuses for this conduct, there is no justification of it. The error brings its punishment, and nearly involves the parties in serious misery. But the story ends happily, though abruptly. During its progress, our author conducts us from Germany to Russia, and from Russia to the fastnesses of the Circassians. Of these people, he affords us some interesting glimpses. Of their war with the Russians, still continued, there are sundry specimens, the characteristics of which are calculated to interest and instruct the reader. The author exhibits considerable knowledge of character. His females are well drawn and pleasingly discriminated. His story shows little of invention, and the conclusion is brought about by such a process as the superior artist is seldom found to employ.

12. *The Conspirator.* By A. E. DUPUY. New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 1850.

THIS is an American story, founded upon the alleged project of Aaron Burr to dismember the Mexican States, form a republic or an empire after his own fashion, and raise himself to the rule thereof. The author has been guilty of a great error, in employing imaginary names in the development of this history. Why? Why call Col. Burr, Col. Alwin, and Blannerhasset, Fitzgerald? What is gained by it? Nothing in the world. It was just as easy, and just as probable, to frame the present story, with the proper names of the parties, as with fictitious ones. What is not lost by it, indeed? All the probabilities. The author confronts history, when history is in possession of all the means of refuting her (the author is of the tender gender) statements. We *know* that the adventures belong to Aaron Burr, and to no one else. The archives of the Union have only one such history, of alleged treason, arrest and trial. The author has trespassed beyond her limits. It is only where truth *dare* not go, that fiction may be bold to venture. It is only where history has *not* written, that art may presume to write. The historical portions of this book are one great blunder. The fictitious are less objectionable. But they are only moderately attractive. There is talent in our author; but, as a novelist, her powers are feeble. The dramatic talent she scarcely possesses, and her invention is small.

13. *The Fathers of the Desert*; or an account of the origin and practice of monkery among heathen nations, its passage into the church, and some wonderful stories of the fathers, concerning the primitive monks and hermits. By HENRY RUFFNER, late President of Washington College, Virginia. In two volumes. New-York: Baker & Scribner. 1850.

OUR author has given us a most curious collection. He has been groping after monachism, through the most remote antiquity accessible to such a service. It has evidently been with him a labour of love, though he is by no means lovingly inclined to the class into whose rookeries he pries. He is a stout son of Knox, Luther and Calvin, and lays about him right lustily, with the quarter-staff of reform. Your ragged tribe of ascetics finds no favour in his eyes. He would have punished St. Anthony, the monk, as a sturdy beggar, and pilloried Simeon Stylites, on a shaft seventy times seventy feet higher than his own, as a penalty for seeking so impertinent an elevation. It is in no indulgent mood that this compilation was made; but the translations from the fathers will afford much curious, and

some instructive reading. The remains, epistles and dialogues of Sulpicius Severus, for example, are quite pleasing, and deserve the encomiums of the translator. The collection which he has made is one that we wonder has never been attempted before. Much of this matter is new to the general reader, and will employ curiously the more profound. Of the tone and conclusions of our author, we say nothing.

14. *Report of Naval Committee*, on establishing a line of mail steamships to the western coast of Africa, and thence, *via* the Mediterranean, to Africa. With an Appendix, added by the American Colonization Society. Washington. Gideon & Co. 1850.

WE are indebted, for a copy of this pamphlet, to the Hon. Mr. Cabell, M. C., whose courtesy we beg leave to acknowledge. The matter of this report, and the Appendix which accompanies it, would require quite a searching review, had we space and leisure for the undertaking. It must suffice to say that we are utterly opposed to the notion, that policy or philanthropy demand of us the construction of lines of steamers to convey free negroes to the coast of Africa. The whole scheme looks like a gross impertinence. To send off free negroes will very soon conduct to the manufacture of free negroes; and we here take leave to express the opinion, that the Colonization Society, without designing it, has exercised almost as mischievous an influence upon the peace of our people, and the safety of our slave institutions, as the direct assaults of the abolitionists. Both assume slavery to be a wrong, and the free negro to be unhappy in the country and the condition in which he was born—neither of which assumptions are true. There are numerous points in this pamphlet, which will probably compel our future consideration.

15. *Lecture, Introductory to the Course on the Institutes and Practice of Medicine*, in the Medical College of the State of South-Carolina. By SAMUEL HENRY DICKSON, M.D. John Russell. 1850.

IN acknowledging the receipt of the above lecture, we cannot pass the opportunity of extending the hand of cordial welcome to one of our most gifted fellow-citizens. After a temporary sojourn at the North, he has returned to us, with his wonted vigour of intellect unimpaired, and his usual gracefulness of diction certainly undiminished; and, more than all, with a head ready to advise, and a hand eager to assist, in accomplishing Southern independence. Such men the State needs, and of such men the State has a right to be proud.



The Lecture opens with a very graceful expression of the Professor's emotion upon re-assuming his former station, and his undisguised pleasure at finding himself again surrounded by the friends of his earlier days. Occasion is then taken to "record the estimate in which he holds the conduct of his colleagues and friends, in reference to his return to, and re-union with, the institution," in which he occupies so prominent a position—and an especial reference is made, with singular felicity and admirable taste, to the particular friend, whose voluntary retirement exhibited so rare an example of social virtue—so singular an instance of generous self-abandonment. We are at a loss which to admire most, the man who can perform an action so truly disinterested, or him whose friendship is valuable enough to call forth such a sacrifice.

The author then makes a very complimentary and thoroughly deserved allusion to his immediate predecessor in the chair of practice, and dwells evidently, with no little pleasure, on the recollection of having had some share in the education of such a pupil. The rest of the Lecture is devoted to a brief anticipatory view of the studies, in which the Professor and his class expect to be engaged in their future meetings.

In conclusion, we need only remark, that the production is, in every way, worthy of the theme, and the acknowledged reputation of Professor Dickson.

16. *The Position and Course of the South.* By WM. HENRY TRESCOT, Esq. Charleston : 1850.

THIS is one of the ablest pamphlets yet issued by the Charleston press, upon the topic now rapidly absorbing every thing else, as of minor importance, in the minds of the people of the South. We regret that we have neither time nor space at present, for more than a very cursory notice of this political brochure, a more full examination of which must be reserved for a future occasion. The formation of a Southern Confederacy, the author seems to regard as a necessary development of the age. He does not deny the vast benefits won for mankind by the confederation of 1789. The Union had a great mission to fulfil ; and, through the sixty years of its being, it has enriched the world with the blessings of untold material wealth, and scattered far and wide the seeds of religious and political wisdom. But its destiny has been achieved, and the time has arrived, according to our author, for the two great geographical sections to sever the bonds which can no longer unite them in mutual interest and affection. For the South, particularly, Mr. Trescot contends,—if she be true to her peculiar mission—is such a consummation inevitable. Government is the reflection of national sentiment, and, when the antagonism of great interests has become vital, it is resolved into its original elements, and the dis-

jecta membra are remoulded into new shapes. The primordial substance remains unchanged, the variation being only a modification, greater or less, of the accident of form. When this antagonism is purely partisan, the result is the ultimate subjection of conflicting interests to the controlling influence of some class: when the diversity is geographical, the struggle must eventuate either in the formation of distinct governments, or in the weaker section sinking down into a state of colonial vassalage. The author approaches his subject with the calmness of one well aware of its magnitude, but with the fearlessness of him who has donned his armor in a great cause, and feels assured of the temper of his steel. He offers us no long columns of statistics—his truths are not to be found in the Secretary's books of the Home Department. He culls no flowers of rhetoric with which to adorn a question that presents no smiling aspect to an earnest mind. He is clear, concise, logical, and there is, in the march of his argument, the consciousness of victory. The young men of the South have solemn duties to meet: Mr. Trescot evidently feels the responsibility, and is willing to discharge his share of the debt.

17. *History of Propellers and Steam Navigation.* With biographical sketches of the early inventors. By ROBERT MCFARLANE, C. E. New-York: Geo. P. Putnam. 1851.

At a moment like the present, when the pressure of external causes render it necessary that the South should assume the possession and profits of its own commerce, and make provision for taking such possession of the high seas, as becomes a section whose exports are of such vast value and variety, we regard every publication like the one before us, as calculated to be eminently beneficial. Though by no means thorough as a book of instruction—to which, indeed, this little volume does not pretend—it is yet sufficiently ample as a history, and will prove, no doubt, particularly useful in the single leading respect for which, according to its author's preface, it was conceived and prepared. He remarks upon the number of repetitions of old and exploded experiments every day, by inventors who have only fallen into error in consequence of their ignorance of what has been already tried and abandoned. The history is a curious one. It will, no doubt, prove instructive. The book is meant to be a popular one. The statements are simplified to common comprehension, and the progress of steam-boat experiment, engines, paddles, wheels and screws, is illustrated step by step, in regular succession, as well by engravings as by the text.

18. *India and the Hindoos* : being a popular view of the geography, history, government, manners, customs, literature and religion of that ancient people ; with an account of Christian Missions among them. By F. DE W. WARD, late Missionary, at Madras, etc. New-York: Baker & Scribner. 1850.

THE title page of this volume sufficiently describes its character. It is just what it professes to be—a popular work on India, affording to the reader, who desires a general knowledge of that great country, and who will be sufficiently satisfied with a superficial one,—all that he needs. The author seems to have sought his information from generally correct sources ; and, where he writes from his own experience, he is no doubt truthful, as he is modest and unobtrusive. His book lacks profundity, but it is without pretension. It troubles us with few of the author's speculations, but it furnishes such a sufficient array of facts, in regard to the several departments of history and geography canvassed, as will enable the reader to speculate for himself.

19. *Petticoat Government*. A Novel. By Mrs. TROLLOPE. Author of "The Refugee in America, etc. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1850.

WE all remember Mrs. Trollope,—that clever virago who stirred the bile among our critics, by her book upon America, nearly twenty years ago. A woman of decided cleverness, smart, sharp, shrewd and combative, she is a much better sketcher and satirist than novelist. Still, she makes a very readable story ; good common sense being the basis, and shrewdness and saliency being the chief characteristics. Her vigor, however, is too much allied with coarseness, to allow of any great delicacy of touch ; and it is the cleverness and freedom of her sketch, rather than its grace, sweetness or spirituality, which will commend it. Her "Petticoat Government" is of this description ;—coarse and strong, free and bold,—of very moderate elevation, and true only to a society which possesses little that is latent. It will interest the general reader, without leaving any impression behind it. Our author's idea of character is too much fashioned after her own. For example, she makes a clergyman, whom she describes as a good and just man,—and who is evidently one of her favorites, lend himself to a deception,—absolutely deliver himself of a lie, on a very petty occasion, and without any necessity, and neither rebukes him herself, nor prompts his own conscience to self-reproach.

20. *Domestic History of the American Revolution.* By Mrs. ELLET. Author of "The Women of the American Revolution." New-York: Baker & Scribner. 1850.

THE materials out of which this volume has been wrought, are very much the same with those which we owe to the author in her excellent work, already amply reviewed in our pages, entitled "The Women of the Revolution." The present work belongs to the series, and will be read with pleasurable interest. It is anecdotal rather than historical; and this, by the way, is rather a recommendation than a fault. Perhaps there is a slight exaggeration in calling it a "Domestic History of the Revolution," unless other volumes are to follow, which we trust will be the case. Mrs. Ellet has again drawn largely from the events of the war in South-Carolina. Let us commend her, in future volumes, to pursue the history of the Carolina patriots to the prison ships, and thence to St. Augustine, Florida, where the history was a long and very painful one.

21. *Chronicle of the Conquest of Grenada.* From the MSS. of FRAY ANTONIO AGAPIDA. New-York: Geo. P. Putnam. 1850.

THIS forms the fourteenth volume of Putnam's beautiful edition of the "Works of Washington Irving." It is newly revised by the author. We have no hesitation in pronouncing this the most truly original and powerful of all of Irving's productions, of a splendor and copiousness far superior to any thing which his pen has issued to the world. It is one of those works which link history and romance in the most beautiful embrace; and the subject has been chosen with singular felicity, as affording the most ample materials for such a union. The author has never been more successful in any of his achievements. Here, he combines the grace and purity of his admirable style, with the richness, the grandeur, and the dignity of a Castilian history in the day of its highest ascendancy and fame; and he rises to the full utterance of all this grandeur.

22. *Shakspeare's Dramatic Works. Illustrated.* A new edition. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1850.

THIS edition of Shakspeare, published in numbers, each of which contains a drama, has reached its twenty-first number; at least, this is the last of the issues which have reached us. There may be others out, for there are frequent failures, in our case, of the parts as they are sent forth. We have had the gaps in our set once already filled up by the publishers; yet another huge one occurs, from the



loss of sundry numbers, which we ask of the booksellers in vain. How long will they thus abuse our patience? We feel this neglect of our rights, and this deficiency in our set, the more, as we regard this as one of the most beautiful editions of Shakspeare which has ever been issued from the American press.

23. *Heroines of the Missionary Enterprise*: or Sketches of Prominent Female Missionaries. By DANIEL C. EDDY.

"But there are deeds which should not pass away,  
And names that must not wither."

Boston: Ticknor, Reed & Fields. 1850.

THIS volume contains thirteen biographical sketches. The subjects are Harriet Newell, Ann H. Hudson, Esther Butler, Elizabeth Herve, Harriet B. Stewart, Sarah L. Smith, Eleanor Macombe, Sarah D. Comstock, Henrietta Shuck, Sarah B. Judson, Annie P. James, Mary E. Van Lennep, and Emily C. Judson. These were all Female Missionaries, perilling life, and undergoing every manner of privation in heathen lands, with the view to the spread of Christ's Gospel. The biographies are full of instructive passages. They reveal the trophies of rare virtue, shown by wonderful faith, courage and endurance. They will, no doubt, contribute to the faith, courage, firm resolve and endurance of others; and, as such, will profitably instruct, even where they fail simply to amuse. The book is very well written.

24. *Haynes' Baptist Cyclopædia*; or Dictionary of Baptist Biography, Antiquities, History, Chronology, Theology, Polity and Literature, etc. By THOMAS WILSON HAYNES. Charleston: Samuel Hart, Sen. 1850.

THIS work, issued in numbers, has at length reached the close of the first volume, and now appears in handsome bulk and binding. It contains a large body of interesting Baptist biography, including the letters from A. to F. An appendix affords a useful catalogue of all the Baptist Churches, Missions and Congregations in America. The editor has performed his task with evident conscientiousness and industry. The work is published in a large type, on fine paper, and in excellent style. It is illustrated by portraits of Hanserd Knowles, Isaac Backus, and Joseph Burroughs, leading minds of the Baptist Church.

25. *Supplement to Frank Forrester's Fish and Fishing of the United States and British Provinces of North America*. By WM. HENRY HERBERT. New-York: Stringer & Townsend. 1850.

OF the very interesting volume of Mr. Herbert, on the Fish and Fishing of our country, we spoke in approving language in a pre-

vious issue. The present volume is designed to supply omissions in the preceding, to correct errors, and add other materials, the better to enrich and enhance the value of the work. This addition is quite important to the completeness of the history; though we doubt not, should Mr. Herbert deem it advisable to try the Southern waters, that he will feel the necessity of other supplements. His contributions, thus far, have supplied a want which the angler and the amateur must have felt a thousand times.

26. *The Unity of the Human Races proved to be the Doctrine of Scripture, Reason and Science.* With a review of the present position and theory of Professor Agassiz. By the Rev. THOMAS SMYTH, D.D., Member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. New-York: Geo. P. Putnam. 1850.

DR. SMYTH is a bold writer, as we may see by the present title page; but we have no purpose to discuss the degree in which his work sustains its assumptions. We turn him over to Messrs. Agassiz, Morton, Nott, and others, whom the course taken by this controversy has reduced to the condition of defendants, without the privilege of a plea to the jurisdiction. It is enough for us to say of Dr. Smith's labors, that they seem to have been urged with a rare industry which merits consideration. He seems to have diligently groped his way among the authorities, and has brought a vast body of evidence to bear upon the question. Of its value in settling the issue between the parties, we shall venture no opinion; rejoinders and surrejoinders, being likely to obviate the necessity for a final judgment upon the case, until that period of general gaol delivery, the Greek Kalends.

27. *The Phantom World: the history of the Philosophy of Spirits, Apparitions, etc.* From the French of Augustine Calmet. With a Preface and Notes, by the Rev. HENRY CHRISTMAS, M. A., F. R. S. F. S. A., etc. Philadelphia: A. Hart, late Carey & Hart. 1850.

WE meet here with an old acquaintance, the work of Calmet, in a new and handsome garb, with an accumulation of valuable notes from a very competent editor. At this moment, when the "Rochester Knockings"—that most absurd of all the histories of modern humbug—are drawing their crowds of wide-mouthed wonderers, it will amuse and instruct to read this collection of ancient superstitions. At all periods, such a collection affords interesting food, for the marvelling faculties of man, which continually strain after higher secrets than any that are ever accorded to his possession. Calmet's book is one of considerable learning, and is interesting from its vast collection of anecdotes, if not from its philoso-

phy. We are grateful to the publisher for an edition, to which the present editor has imparted so much additional value.

28. 1. *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Thomas Chalmers, D.D., L.L.D.* By his son-in-law, the Rev. WILLIAM HANNA, L.L.D. In three vols. Vol. i. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1850.
2. *Posthumous Works of the Rev. Thomas Chalmers, D.D., L. L.D.* Edited by the Rev. WILLIAM HANNA, L.L.D. Vol. ix. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1850.

To the thousands of admirers of the late Dr. Chalmers, it will be a sufficient recommendation to say of the biography given by his son-in-law, that it unfolds the personal, religious and intellectual career of his distinguished subject, in a manner not undeserving of his fame. The ninth volume of his works, just published, is a highly interesting one. It contains his "Prelections on Butler's Analogy, Paley's Evidences of Christianity, and Hill's Lectures on Divinity." It comprises also a number of Lectures and Addresses, on moral, religious, and educational subjects.

29. *Report of the Debates in the Convention of California, on the Formation of the State Constitution, in September and October, 1849.* By J. ROSS BROWNE. Washington: John T. Towers. 1850.

WE are indebted to the Hon. W. F. Colcock, for a copy of this publication, which affords no high proof of the presence in California of the profoundest wisdom, or of the highest sense of propriety and justice. Of the atrocious efforts of the squatters in that region to exclude the South, by grasping at a territory, the marvellous extent of which they did not themselves dream of, this volume gives a sufficient idea. There was just sense enough in the Convention to suspect that the selfishness of their scheme, and the avaricious insolence of their grasp, would defeat their own object; but, unhappily, there was by no means enough to leaven the mass of ignorance and impudence which prevailed in the hotchpot Convention, of which this report affords no grateful history.

30. *Adelaide Lindsay.* A Novel. Edited by the author of "the Wilmingtons," etc. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1850.

MRS. MARSH, of late, promises to become quite as prolific a novelist as Mr. James. Her volumes are growing numerous; but we are not sure that they are growing better. In respect to invention, Mrs. Marsh has always been a defective writer. Her plots exhibit as little art, as variety. Her chief merits lie in the development of de-

licate traits of sensibility. Sweetness and purity, with an excess of refinement, are the traits of her favorite characters. In the trials to which they are subjected, she frequently succeeds in producing the effects of pathos; though it is difficult to say that she has written any one work, since the beginning of her career, which so well exhibits the pathetic as in the very first, by which she became known to us, namely, the "Two Old Men's Tales." Her powers are not large, nor are they distinguished by any variety. She overflows too much with the sentimental, and this is too frequently at the expense of strength, and runs into tedious diffuseness, and a fondness for household minutiae. Adelaide Lindsay is a pretty story enough, but with a too excessive refinement of sentiment, both in heroine and hero. The latter, indeed, makes a great fool of himself in more than one respect, though our author has endowed him with many noble and honorable traits.

31. *The World's Progress: a Dictionary of Dates.* With tabular views of General History, and a Historical Chart. Edited by G. P. PUTNAM, member of the Amer. Ethnol. Society, of N. Y. Hist. Soc., etc. New-York: G. P. Putnam. 1851.

MR. PUTNAM is a gentleman admirably fitted for the preparation of such a work as the above. He combines all the requisites of intelligence, discrimination, industry, habitual research,—and, which is more—a chronological mind;—and a chronological mind, like the mathematical and poetical, is born, not made; though it may be greatly helped, like all others, by education. This volume is a highly valuable compilation, and supplies a real want of the student. Though still lacking in several respects, it is, by far, the best hand book of time and the world's progress, that we have seen. We recommend to our author, in his next edition, to endeavour to have more fullness in his American facts. His omissions are singularly numerous as regards the distinguished persons of the South during the Revolution—a defect in Northern books of history and biography, of which the South has constant cause of complaint.

32. *Alton Locke, Tailor and Poet.* An auto-biography. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1850.

THERE are proofs of very considerable talent in this volume, some passages rising into great power of utterance, and others being marked with capacity for acute philosophical analysis. The interest of the narrative, however, is greatly impaired by the writer's partisanship. He is an advocate of chartism—is measurably a communist—a great believer in Carlyle, and one who aims, however, earnestly, but vaguely, at reform. Of the sources of popular evil, he is not possessed—he either goes too deeply, or not deeply enough,



for the discovery of the seeds of sorrow in the world. It is difficult to say that he is not right, where he certainly is wrong, and not wrong, where he obviously reasons from right premises; and all from his want of thoroughness. But his powers are unquestionable, and some of his sketches and portraits very admirable.

33. *Education and Literature in Virginia.* An Address delivered before the Literary Societies of Washington College, Lexington, Virginia, 18th June, 1850. By JOHN R. THOMPSON, of Richmond. Richmond: H. K. Ellyson. 1850.

THIS is a well written, highly polished and graceful discourse, from the pen of the editor of the Southern Messenger. Mr. Thompson grasps his theme with courage, and discusses it with knowledge and judgment. He exhibits a mournful picture of public, or common school education in Virginia; very much such a picture as might be drawn of the condition of popular education in our own State. We are glad to perceive that he indicates, with as much earnestness as propriety, the evil influence, to letters and arts, in Virginia,—as in all the South,—of a marked passion for political distinction;—an evil which has made quite too many Southern politicians the mere pensioners of the Federal Government. Mr. Thompson, passingly, has his fling at abolition and Northern fanaticism,—of which the name is legion—but he preaches union in spite of all;—the benefits of which, it seems, are to be preferred infinitely to loss of position—loss of territory—loss of property—and, of course, right and liberty. We cannot concur with him here. In other respects, we find his discourse well written, and distinguished by sound discretion and a happy taste.

34. *The Works of Frederika Bremer.* 1. *The Neighbours; a Story of Every Day Life.* By FRÉDERIKA BREMER. Translated from the Swedish. By Mary Howitt. Author's edition, with a new preface. New-York: G. P. Putnam. 1850. 2. *Home; or Family Cares and Family Joys.* By FRÉDERIKA BREMER. Translated by Mary Howitt. New-York: G. P. Putnam. 1850.

THE first of these volumes was republished some time ago, as the initial issue of a new and beautiful library edition of all the writings of its amiable and accomplished author. The second has just reached us from the same publisher, and fully sustains the claims, in behalf of the edition, established by the first. Miss Bremer is still in this country. She has made a favorable impression wherever she has gone. Of her writings, we need scarcely speak. Their characteristics, as true, graceful and admirable delineations of society and life in Sweden, and as containing the most felicitous do-

mestic portraiture, are universally acknowledged. The first of these volumes contains a much too flattering portrait of the author, and a sketch of her residence in Sweden, which may not be quite so flattering.

35. *Health, Disease and Remedy, familiarly and practically considered, in a few of their relations to the blood.* By GEORGE MOORE, M.D., Member of the Royal College of Physicians, etc. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1850.

THIS is a compact treatise, clear and simple, upon a subject that naturally comes home to the sympathies and interests of all the race of man. Our author has, apparently, striven to make his treatise popular by its thorough simplification. The health of man—his diseases and their remedies—should not be a mystery confined to a single class. Every man, having reached full age, should, to a certain extent, become his own physician. He should, at all events, be able to know when he *really* needs other help than that which abstinence and ablutions might afford. This little volume will, probably, help him to this moderate, but important degree of knowledge.

36. *Success in Life. The Mechanic.* By MRS. L. C. TUTHILL. New-York: Geo. P. Putnam. 1850.

A PLEASANT little volume for the young and unlearned reader; the second of a series, of which the first, if we rightly recollect, was devoted to the career of The Merchant, as this is to that of The Mechanic. The writer, in a simple, unaffected manner, exhibits the career of sundry distinguished mechanics, and self taught men who made a figure in the world—such as Franklin, Fitch, Fulton, Whitney, and others. Hints, in respect to morals and mechanics, trade, inventions, etc., are pleasantly interspersed with the biographical sketches. The book is neatly got up, well printed, and illustrated with plates.

37. *Iconographic Encyclopædia of Science, Literature and Art; systematically arranged;* by G. HECK. New-York: Rudolph Garrigue. 1850. *Charleston Agent, S. Hart, Sen.*

THIS admirable Encyclopædia, of which we have more than once spoken in terms of highest favor, has at length closed its first volume, and in the twelfth number opens upon a second. The thirteenth portfolio has just reached us, with its usual proportion of engraved illustrations. The subject of this number is Geography. We beg to repeat our previous recommendations. There is no fal-

ling off in the style or character of this work. Each successive issue only confirms its claim to public favor.

38. *History of Madame Roland*. By JOHN S. C. ABBOTT, with engravings. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1850.

A NEAT and well told narrative of the career of Madame Roland, that female leader of the unfortunate, the gifted, the feeble, the philanthropic party of the Girondins of France—their soul, perhaps, but not their saving spirit—one destined to inspire and to share their dreams, and their melancholy destiny, and to deplore, without being able to arrest, the progress of that fiery fiend which they had helped to raise, and which they had idly christened with the name of Liberty. This volume is a worthy companion of the pleasant series of biographies and histories, which the younger class of readers owe to the pens of Jacob and John S. Abbott.

39. *History of Xerxes the Great*. By JACOB ABBOTT, with engravings. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1850.

ANOTHER of the long and pleasing series of school histories, which we owe to the Brothers Abbott. This, of Darius, is quite as worthy of perusal as any of its predecessors. It is issued in the same handsome style, and well supplied with illustrations.

40. *Dies Boreales; or Christopher under Canvas*. By Professor JOHN WILSON, author of "Noctes Ambrosianæ," etc. Philadelphia: A. Hart, late Carey & Hart.

THE fanciful and philosophical papers of Wilson, in recent numbers of Blackwood, bearing this title, are here collected in a handsome volume, uniform with the volumes of the same author, already issued by the present publisher. The "Dies Boreales," are not unworthy of the companionship. They are eloquent always, if not always sound; and the fancy of the author reconciles us frequently to a philosophy with which we might sometimes quarrel.

#### 41. Prose Fiction.

1. *Ellen Parry; or Trials of the Heart*. By OLIVIA. New-York: Appleton & Co. 1850. A quiet moral story, of negative qualities and of no particular interest. It is, however, unobjectionable, and, if it effects little good, in consequence of its lack of attraction, it can do harm, as well for this as other reasons.

2. *An Old Country House*. A novel. By the author of "the Gambler's Wife," etc. New-York: Stringer & Townsend. 1850. A story of gloomy character—moody, wild, monotonous—of a house

of madness and crime—dark, without sufficient relief—in short, a story where the materials are clumsily used, without proper art, and which fail of effect, not because of their inferior value, but because of the inferior management of the artist.

3. *The Deserted Wife*. By EMMA D. E. HEWITT SOUTHWORTH. Author of "Retribution," etc. New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 1850. A story of unquestionable interest, and full of proofs of talent in the author; but wrought out of old materials, and too frequently questionable in its moral tendency. A work of evil passions, sometimes triumphant, and of power as irregular and untrained, as decided and vehement.

4. *Margaret Percival in America*. A tale. Edited by a New-England Minister, A.B.; being a sequel to Margaret Percival. A tale. Edited by Rev. W. SEWELL, B.A. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1850. Here is a clever argumentative effort to beat the churchmen on their own ground. Miss Sewell, otherwise Margaret Percival, is translated to New-England, and there readily translated into a dissenter. The process is a very clever one, and the author exhibits very considerable dexterity in bowling down the doctrines of the English church establishment, and such also as he himself sets up on its account, with the same purpose. In executing these objects, our author has, however, somewhat failed in doing that in which Miss Seward has succeeded very happily, and on which her religious tales have chiefly depended for their large circulation. He has not made his story quite so clever as his argument. He has forgotten the one object in the other.

5. *The Green Hand*. A "short" yarn. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1850. The reader must not suffer himself to be imposed upon. This "short" yarn is an exceeding long one, running through nearly two hundred octavo pages, closely printed. But with this he will have no cause of quarrel. The story is a clever and highly spirited one—a nautical narrative, as the name would indicate—in much of the peculiar picturesque manner of Cooper, with a closeness of details in the fashion of Marryatt. Some of its descriptions are very fine and graphic.

6. *The Two Brothers*; or the family that lived in the best society. A novel. Phila: A. Hart, late Carey & Hart. 1850. An excellent domestic novel, full of admirable social morals, with this advantage over most moral stories—professedly such—that the story is not swallowed up in the moral. The interest of the tale is not for a moment suspended, in order that the author's philosophies and satires may take their turn with the reader. The scene, by the way, is in German life, and the work is probably a translation from the German, though we are nowhere told so.

7. *Midsummer Fays*, or the Holidays at Woodleigh. By SUSAN PINDAR, author of "Fireside Fairies," etc. New-York: Appleton & Co. 1850. A pretty little gift book and story for the young, with numerous engravings on wood.



8. *The Country Year Book*; or the Field, the Forest, and the Fireside. By WILLIAM HOWITT. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1850. William and Mary Howitt are among the best pourtrayers of rural English life that we know. The former, especially, has distinguished himself by frequent publications of this character, all pleasant and instructive—not ambitious, but natural and homely—suitable to the fireside in winter, and grateful to pure tastes and a modest, genial philanthropy. The present is a book of the months, as well as the seasons—is essayical—relieved with anecdote and narrative, and interspersed with moral poetry of a respectable character.

42. *The Companion.* After Dinner Table-Talk. By CHETWOOD EVELYN, Esq. "This is the motley-minded gentleman." New-York: Geo. P. Putnam. 1850.

A PLEASANT companion enough!—a collection of clever things, anecdotes and fine sayings, made with good taste and judgment, almost wholly from modern British authors. A neatly printed volume, ornamented with a fine portrait of Sidney Smith, the very prince of table companions.

43. *An Address*, delivered before Harmony Lodge, No. 17, at Barnwell Court House, (South-Carolina,) 24th June, 1850. By Bro. S. W. TROTT. Augusta: J. McCafferty. 1850.

A GOOD moral discourse for masonic bodies, insisting upon labour, diligence and virtue, in the several callings of life.

44. *Contributions to Obstetrics*, with tabular views and miscellaneous practical observations. By HENRY A. RAMSAY, M.D. Raysville, Geo. 1850.

A TREATISE originally published in the Medical Examiner, and of particular interest to practitioners in the South. The subject is properly left to them, and it is for them to determine upon the merits of this treatise, which, as it is issued in pamphlet form, must be assumed to possess special merits.

45. *Our Saviour, with Prophets and Apostles.* A series of eighteen highly finished engravings, with descriptions by several American Divines. Edited by the Rev. J. M. WAINWRIGHT, D.D. New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 1851.

THIS volume appropriately follows two others of a like character, which were sent forth by the same publisher, as gift books for preceding years. It is superior to both. The literature is highly creditable, sensible, pure, and not extravagant in the exhibition of reli-

gious enthusiasm, which is apt to be the fault of such publications. The particular excellence of the work however—beautiful as is its letter press and exterior—is in the unique character of the designs of the artist, and the excellence of the engravings. If it is permissible to attempt a portrait of the Divine Master at all—which Washington Allston expressly denies—then we may honestly approve the beautiful conception of the artist in the present instance. It is certainly a very felicitous portrait of divine sentiment, subliming mortal beauty, and reconciling us to its ascent from earth. We are pleased with most of the imaginative portraits of the collection. These are all individual—the great difficulty in such a collection, and more particularly where all the portraits issue from the hands of the same artist. Mr. Wood—a painter hitherto wholly unknown to us—has succeeded, with singular spirit, in his task. St. Peter, Paul, Luke, and King David seem to us among the best of these achievements. We are not prepared wholly to approve of that of Solomon, the defect of which seems the excess of effeminacy. The Syrian cast of features which he has bestowed upon him was perhaps well; but this expression has been too much emphasized. In seizing it, the artist appears to us to have omitted some of those traits which should have been conspicuous in the representation of one of the most subtle, if not selfish, of the politicians of his age and people. We regard King Solomon as the Augustus Cæsar of his nation, with more of the voluptuary in his constitution, as became the narrow region to which he belonged, and less, perhaps, of the statesman: for it is undeniably true, that, in extending the glory of his kingdom, and giving it a bright and glittering exterior, Solomon planted those seeds of ruin in his empire, the fruits of which enured, with terrible fatality, to his successors and his people. There is one thing more to be said about these portraits of Mr. Wood. It appears to us that he has given to them a much more Roman than Jewish style. Now, the national type, in such pictures, constitutes one of their chief necessities, which propriety finds indispensable. Altogether, the book is one of the most beautiful, and one of the most appropriate, of the publications of the holidays. We owe our copy to Mr. John Russell.

46. *Evenings at Donaldson Manor*; or the Christmas Guest. By MARIA J. MCINTOSH, author of "Woman in America," etc. Illustrated with steel engravings. New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 1851. Charleston: John Russell.

WE do not so much regard this work as a gift for the holidays, as it is evidently designed by the publisher to be—rich in embossed cover, fair and persuasive in type and paper, and exquisite in illustrative pictures—as a story by one of the cleverest female writers

of prose fiction in America. This is the just claim and right of Miss McIntosh. Her previous narratives have been all eminently successful. They have all shown the most conclusive proofs of a vigorous understanding, a refined taste, and a sweet feminine philosophy. Here, in the sketches before us—which are those of a winter fireside in the South—she is evidently at home. Her domestic portraiture is very good and very genial. She is not so bold as truthful in her delineations—not so fanciful as graceful and correct, and not so imaginative as fanciful and delicate. Her writings are such as the reader, whether male or female, can safely rely upon. To the former they come commended by good sense; to the latter by pure tastes and a gentle, loving spirit.

47. *A Book of the Passions.* By G. P. R. JAMES, Esq. Illustrated by sixteen splendid steel engravings, from drawings by the most eminent artists. New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 1851.

THIS beautifully printed and exquisitely illustrated volume is not new to us. It is a reprint from the London edition, first issued several years ago. To the eye, there are few things of this sort more likely to afford pleasure. The designs are full of spirit and beauty, and the engravings of the first excellence. The style of publication is worthy of the house from which it issues. But of the tales, or sketches of the passions, which constitute the literature of the volume, we can say but little, and that is not favourable. We wonder that it should have been thought advisable to issue a new American edition, of a publication that was so entirely unworthy of the grand costume in which it originally appeared. Mr. James was never less fortunate in his literary adventures than in the present. It is out of his line entirely. His *forte* lies in minute detail, in the grouping together of numerous facts and events, however small, and concentrating them for the final issue. The generalization of the passions, the intense sublimation of these in autobiographical form, requires powers of which he has never shown the least possession.

48. *The Night Side of Nature; or Ghosts and Ghost-Seers.* By CATHARINE CROWE, author of "Susan Hopley," "Lily Dawson," etc. New-York: J. S. Redfield. 1850.

THE subject of this very interesting volume is one that commends itself, in the highest degree, to humanity. Whatever may be said by mis-called science and philosophy, and by the presumption of those who profess incredulity, only because of an excess of self-esteem, the human mind is always largely interested with the concerns of the spiritual world, and the soul naturally desires a better acquaintance with that to which it inevitably hastens. We are all,

too, more or less prepared to believe that there are mysteries of our nature, the clues of which have been repeatedly in our hands. We are all compelled to acknowledge that our philosophy continually falls short of the discovery of a thousand truths of nature, which are probably yet destined to be decyphered by the living races of men. The introductory chapter of Mrs. Crowe, on this subject, is particularly full of suggestion, and is remarkably well written. The contents of her volume are at once lively, impressive and instructive. They should compel a pause in the too hasty judgment which decides against facts imperfectly known and understood. We may add, that, while the author writes with a very sensible philosophy, she has produced such a book as will not do to be read by very nervous persons in the small hours of the night.

49. *The Ministry of the Beautiful*. By HENRY JAMES SLACK, F.G.S., of the Middle Temple. Philadelphia: A. Hart, late Carey & Hart. 1850.

A VERY pretty and pleasant volume, the object of which is to illustrate the sources, and encourage the study of, and search after, the beautiful, as it exists in nature—in seasons, scenes and situations. The sky, the earth and sea, the city and the shore, the field and the forest, are thus all, in turn, made to exhibit the ministry of the beautiful, when pursued by the appreciative sense, and proper tastes and affinities.

### 50. Pamphlets.

1. *Researches upon the Necropolis of New-Orleans*, with brief allusions to its vital arithmetic. By BENNET DOWLER, M.D. New-Orleans: Betts & Clark. 1850. A very interesting subject, which our author grasps with his usual enthusiasm, and treats with equal eloquence and acumen. His facts are very interesting, and his capacity to discriminate and analyze them is conclusively displayed in the present pamphlet, which may be provocative, hereafter, of more elaborate notice.

2. *Some aid to a clear perception of our actual dependence upon Home Production, and the consequent wisdom of defending our own industry from every danger*. By JONATHAN B. WISE. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1849. An argument for a protective tariff. This pamphlet is probably designed to affect and influence the existing administration of the country. But the administration is neither subtle enough, nor strong enough, to influence decisively the policy of the country, in any essential respect. The argument of Mr. Wise is one which sets out with a few mistakes and misconceptions, which impair the value of his figures. If he



were reasoning to one people only, having the same single interest—addressing himself, in short, to Pennsylvania or Connecticut alone—the argument might be justly based upon correct premises ; but it fails wholly, in regard to a league of States, where the interests are several, and singularly in conflict.

3. *Slavery* : a treatise, showing that slavery is neither a moral, political, nor social evil. Penfield, Ga.: Benjamin Brantley. 1850. This has been shown a hundred times before. It is the misfortune, only, that the world is always crowded with a large proportion of those who will not see. But for this, the prophets had never cried universally in vain. It is, however, one of the good results of the slavery controversy, that the truth has been made apparent to the slaveholder himself. The more investigation has advanced, the more has he been able to satisfy his conscience with the conviction that slavery was a cherished institution of the Deity, in all lands and ages, and has been the only means of training a wild and savage people to the walks of humanity first, and finally of civilization. We do not see that our author has brought any new lights to bear upon the subject ; but we rejoice, nevertheless, at every additional witness for the cause.

4. *Review of Dr. Drake's Work on the Principal Diseases of the Interior Valley of North America.* By BENNET DOWLER, M.D. New-Orleans : W. A. Betts. 1850. Who shall decide, when doctors disagree ? is a question that reviewers are by no means bound to answer. We leave it to the faculty to fight it out, relying upon a proverb which teaches that, when two of a trade fall out, the rest of the world is always the gainer. Dr. Drake has a high reputation in the West, and Dr. Dowler an admitted and growing one. He is industrious, vigilant, careful and thoughtful, and writes with great spirit, and in a good style.

5. *A Response to a Professor, and a Speculation on the Sensorium.* By BENNET DOWLER, M.D. New-Orleans : Weld & Co. 1850. We have previously spoken of the pamphlets of Dr. Dowler, as possessing special claims to the attention of the anatomist and philosopher, as well in respect to the abilities of the writer as to the novelty of his speculations and experiments. The essay before us has been elicited by the discussions which these pamphlets have provoked, and is meant still farther to illustrate the previous opinions of the author, whose views and discoveries are of a sort to compel consideration and stimulate curiosity. That they should provoke discussion is necessarily due, as well to the claims of Dr. Dowler, as to the originality of his suggestions.

6. *Perforations in the "Latter Day Pamphlets."* By one of the "Eighteen Millions of Bore" Edited by ELIZUR WRIGHT. Boston : Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1850. These should be called Pokings at the "Latter Day Pamphlets ;" not perforations in them.

Mr. Elizur Wright declaims with savage unction and earnestness, and rounds his periods with considerable dexterity. But his talk is mostly commonplace, and, when we find him expending whole pages upon one of the scornful sarcasms of Carlyle—as if the latter designed it for an argument, or anything more than a contemptuous way of flinging aside a popular delusion—we see that Mr. Wright is only capable of beating the air. It is probable that this *first* number of the “Perforations” will remain without a successor.

7. *Letter to his Excellency, Whitemarsh B. Seabrook, Governor of the State of South-Carolina, on the Dissolution of the Union.* [By Hon. W. J. GRAYSON.] Charleston. 1850. We lament this publication, for the author's sake. For the same reason, we forbear to discuss it. Its topics have been already under examination in our pages, and are of a sort to continue long under discussion.

8. [*Letter*] *to the Hon. W. J. Grayson.* Charleston. 1850. A spirited reply to the preceding pamphlet, in which the views of Mr. Grayson are examined and answered.

9. *Observations on State Sovereignty, Federal usurpations, and State interposition.* “*Cujus est condere, ejus est, et interpretari.*” By ROBERT J. TURNBULL, M.D. New-York: Published by Cornish, Lamport & Co. 1850. A thick and comprehensive pamphlet, to which we cannot do justice within our present limits. It must be set aside for future notice. Dr. Turnbull inherits his political sentiments, and has thus a double claim to our consideration, particularly at the present juncture.

10. *The Southern States*, their present peril and their certain remedy. Why do they not right themselves, and thus fulfil their glorious destiny? Charleston: Edward C. Councell. 1850. This pamphlet, by John Townsend, Esq., a member of the South-Carolina Legislature, is calm, sensible and resolute. He clearly reviews the whole subject of our relations with the federal government, and conclusively shows how destructive to the South is the present system, and how easy are the means of relief and redress.

11. *The Rightful Remedy.* Addressed to the slaveholders of the South. By EDWARD B. BRYAN. Charleston. 1850. Mr. Bryan exhibits very considerable research in this pamphlet, a bold spirit, and a logical capacity for argument. His remedy for our existing political evils, is secession, by the South, from the confederacy.

## 51. *Speeches and Public Discourses.*

1. *The Origin and Growth of Civil Liberty in Maryland.* A discourse delivered by GEO. WM. BROWN, before the Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, April 12, 1850, being the fifth Annual Address to that Association. Baltimore: John D. Toy. 1850. A thoughtful and sensible discourse, showing equal discrimination

and research. The author confines himself strictly to his subject, and with his material in full possession, has given us an essay which admirably illustrates the social progress of Maryland from her first establishment as a colony, to her present honorable condition as a State. We congratulate the Historical Society of Maryland, on the earnest and well continued prosecution of their labours in this behalf. Such societies are of great and growing importance, and will prove invaluable to the future historian and student. They should exist in all the States.

2. *The Rights and the Duties of Masters.* A Sermon preached at the dedication of a Church, erected in Charleston, S. C., for the benefit and instruction of the coloured population. By Rev. J. H. THORNWELL, D.D. Charleston: Walker & James. 1850. The foreign reader of this title page must not suppose that, until the erection of this church for the negro in Charleston, he had no place assigned him for religious instruction: He had a portion in all the churches of the city and country, which were frequented by the master. But increasing numbers, required an increase of places of public worship, and this and other churches have been raised in consequence. This Sermon of Dr. Thornwell is worthy of his reputation. It is well thought, and well expressed. We had marked several passages for quotation had our space allowed it—passages equally distinguished by eloquence and a just philosophy. There is one, however, to which we take exception. That class of scientific men who deny the negro an equal degree of intellect with the white man, and insist upon his inferior appointments, as, indeed, the true justification for his bondage, do not deny his christian responsibilities, and his claims, as a human being, upon the care of man and the concern of God. The insinuation to the contrary is very improperly made. So, also, it seems to us an impropriety, to designate as infidels, those who thus distinguish between the two races. They, at least, deny that they are so.

3. *Sermon occasioned by the death of President Taylor*; delivered at the Masonic Hall, Cincinnati, August 1, 1850. By J. H. STOCKTON. Cincinnati: Franklin Printing Office. 1850. This is a singular specimen of pulpit eloquence, quite as remarkable in conception as in style. The reader will agree with us that the following passage affords quite a startling array of General Taylor's *short-comings*;—by which he came into the Presidency.

"*Whence had he come?* He had come—from God. He had come, according to the will of God—from a life, extended through more than sixty years of time, and over many thousand miles of space. He had come—from a Virginia cradle. He had come—from a Kentucky school. He had come—from the New-Orleans pestilence. He had come—from the red sward of Tippecanoe. He had come—from the fiery ramparts of Fort Harrison. He had come—from Green Bay. He had come—from Fort Jessup. He



had come—from Jefferson Barracks. He had come—from the Metropolitan Council. He had come—from the Black Hawk trail. He had come—from Fort Crawford. He had come—from the Florida Swamps. He had come from Fort Jessup, again. He had come—from Fort Gibson. He had come—from the Texan prairies. He had come—from the Mexican hills. He had come—from his Louisiana home: the home where his fond wife waited and his fair daughter bloomed: the home where his war-worn age, infinitely preferring peace to strife, has hoped to find its rest. He had come—with this hope disappointed: but kindly and honorably so—by the highest request of the nation and the widest applause of the world."

The whole performance abounds in passages of like peculiar eloquence.

4. *Speech of the Hon. D. L. Yulee, of Florida, on the admission of California.* Delivered in the Senate of the U. S., Tuesday, August 6, 1850. Washington: Globe office. 1850. This is one of the most thoroughly sound, sensible, and elaborate of all the speeches delivered in Congress, the last session, upon the fruitful subject of California and its admission into the Union. Mr. Yulee has thoroughly searched the question and exhausted it. His speech is one that deserves preservation.

5. *Eulogy on the late Hon. John C. Calhoun*, delivered before the Cliosophic and Chrestomathic Societies of the College of Charleston, on Thursday, July 6, 1850. By FRED. A. PORCHER, Professor of History, etc. Charleston: John Russell. 1850. A sensible and thoughtful discourse, which reviews the whole career of Mr. Calhoun, and puts a right estimate upon his great public services, his comprehensive grasp of intellect, his patriotism and pure public and private character. Professor Porcher is no indiscriminating eulogist. He approaches his subject with a proper reverence, but with a just, appreciative judgment. His style is eminently clear and agreeable.

6. *An Address*, delivered before the Literary Societies of the University of Virginia, on the Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, by the State of Virginia. By JOHN TYLER. Charlottesville: 1850. This address, by the Ex-President of the United States, is in the right spirit, its politics of the proper kind, its doctrines unquestionable, its views comprehensive, its counsels valuable. There is a spirit re-arousing itself in Virginia, after a long slumber, which shall yet place her in the front rank, as the champion of Southern Rights.

7. *An Oration*, delivered before the Fourth July Association, at the Hibernian Hall, [Charleston,] July Fourth, 1850. By W. ALLSTON PRINGLE. Charleston: Walker & James. 1850. The spirit and taste of Mr. Pringle's oration are equally good. It is our regret that we cannot enable our readers to judge of them by extracts. It is another of the thousand indications which the day



brings forth, of the conviction pressing upon the people of the South, that they are suffering such wrongs as their fathers resisted with the sword. The conviction once fully, fairly felt, and the patriotism that blushes for the present, will approve itself worthy of the past.

8. *An Address*, delivered before the Society of Alumni of the University of Virginia, at its annual meeting. By M. R. H. GARNETT. Charlottesville, Va. 1850. An excellent and thoughtful address, singularly acute and suggestive, which deserves infinitely closer attention, and much more space than we can now afford it. Mr. Garnett, in this and other like performances, has shown himself one of the best thinkers and writers of the South.

9. *An Address on Popular Education in Virginia, etc.*, delivered at the annual commencement of Richmond College, by JOHN HOWARD, Esq. Richmond: 1850. A pamphlet, every page of which teems with suggestions, each of which demands the nicest consideration. We shall, hereafter, take up the subject of popular education in the South, when we hope to make its contents available. For the present, it is as much as we can say of this address, that it exhibits research, earnestness and thought.

10. *Dictionary of Mechanics, Engine Work, and Engineering*. New-York: Appleton & Co. The twentieth number of this valuable work concludes the first volume, containing 960 pages. With the twenty-first commences the second volume. We need only repeat our commendations previously expressed. To the mechanic, the work is a library in itself, and of the most useful and instructive character.

52. *The Nightingale, or the Jenny Lind Songster*. Devoted to the publication of the choicest songs sung by Jenny Lind, etc. New-York: Stringer & Townsend. 1850.

JENNY LIND is just now the escape-valve of popular enthusiasm in the Northern States, as Fanny Ellsler, Fanny Wright, Fanny Kemble, Fanny Dickens, and a score of other Fannies, have been at previous seasons. It is just as well that it should be so, since it carries off the peccant humours of the public. This little song book, of which the four first numbers are before us, is one of the modes by which publishers, as well as hatters, find their profit in vulgar rages. The songs are well selected, and with the accompanying music, the publication is a very useful one—it affords the popular music of the day at a ridiculously cheap rate.

53. *Elfreide of Guldal*, a Scandinavian Legend; and other Poems. By MARKS OF BARHAMVILLE. New-York: Appleton & Co. 1850.

WE should have been better pleased with this volume had it been the work of a younger writer. It is in doubtful propriety that

one offers himself to the Muses in his old age. These ladies, like all others of the sex, have a decided preference for youth. We do not say, however, that Mr. Marks is an old man, or at all too old for their purposes; but we have been so much accustomed to consider him only in the character of a first rate teacher of young women, that we somehow fail to reconcile it to our thought to recognize him in his new vocation. The following is a fair specimen of his metrical performances :

“ NACOOCHEE.

Thy vale, sweet Nacoochee,  
Midst slumbers of night,  
Comes over my vision  
In garments of light ;  
I see thee—still see thee—  
A vestal all bright,  
Array'd in thy vestments  
For eve's coming rite.

While Yonah, uplifting  
His forehead on high,  
Like prophet preparing  
For sacrifice nigh—  
Thou, sweetest of virgins,  
Meek bending below,  
Like an angel of peace  
Wreath'st with chaplet thy brow. !

And see in the distance,  
Still rises to view  
The pure glowing heavens  
Of dazzling hue.  
And bright tissu'd crimson,—  
And, towering on high,  
Dark Yonah scowls darkly  
Against the bright sky.

While over thy valley,  
Nacoochee, there gleams  
The moon's early crescent,  
Or sun's latest beams ;  
O, it seems as if Heaven  
Affianced, would be  
Still nearer—still dearer,  
Nacoochee, to thee !”

54. *Magazines.* 1. The Southern Literary Messenger. Richmond: John R. Thompson. 1850. 2. De Bow's Review. New-Orleans: 1850. 3. Harper's New Monthly Magazine. New-York: Harper and Brothers. 1850. The International: A Miscellany of Literature, Science and Art. New-York: Stringer & Townsend. 1850. The Literary World. New-York: E. A. & Geo. Duyckinck. 1850. The Schoolfellow: A Magazine for Boys and Girls. Edited by WILLIAM C. RICHARDS, vols. 1 and 2. Charleston: Walker & Richards. 1849-'50.

OUR excellent contemporary, the *Southern Literary Messenger*, pursues the even tenor of its way, always calm, graceful, sensible, and discriminating. We are sure of wholesome morals, sound doctrine, correct literature, and a pleasing miscellany in its monthly issues. Its editor is a man of equal taste and industry. *Samuel Hart, Sen., Agent.*

*De Bow's Review*, is one of the most useful of the monthly publications, accumulating at such periods a large and valuable body of statistics and opinion, such as we rarely find in any other form of publication. The editor is a person of rare industry and enthusiasm. His work is particularly important to the commercial community of the South. *De Bow, Agent.*

*Harper's New Monthly Magazine*, is one of the most beautifully printed of all our periodicals. It is also one of the most various and cheap. The materials are almost wholly selected from foreign publications. These selections are made with good judgment and correct taste. *John Russell, Agent.*

*The International* is a publication of the same class, but with a character more decidedly literary. Much of its matter is local, and it appropriates a large portion of its pages to original contributions and criticism. The two monthlies do not conflict, and are both highly attractive to the general reader. *Courtenay & Weinges, Agents.*

*The Literary World*, differs from both in its entire originality, and in the more economic attention to the daily progress of letters at home. It is one of our best miscellanies. Its editors are well read, good writers, and men of correct and cultivated tastes. *John Russell, Agent.*

*The Schoolfellow*: This juvenile periodical is decidedly superior to any of its class issued from the American press. It is equally judicious in the composition and compilation of its literature, and neat and attractive in its mechanical aspects. We have no doubt that it will prove an admirable nursery for youthful thoughts, informing them with proper motives, and exciting them with incentives to an honorable ambition.